

# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XXXIII, 3.

WHOLE NO. 131.

---

## I.—A HINDU BOOK OF TALES: THE VIKRAMA-CARITA.

This paper is intended partly to serve as a provisional preface to a work which the writer hopes to publish in time, and which will comprise critical editions of the Vikramacarita in all important Sanskrit versions, with accompanying translations and complete commentaries. The writer's intention is to treat as fully and thoroughly as in him lies all the problems that come up in connection with this story-collection,—whether literary, historical or philological in the narrow sense. Not the least interesting or important chapter, I hope, will be the part dealing with later developments of these stories, or of congeneric themes, both in and out of India. The present paper may be regarded, then, as the first part of an introduction to this work. Its aim is to tell briefly what the Vikramacarita is, what place it holds in Hindu literature, what literary, esthetic and moral ideas are dominant in it; furthermore, to give some idea of the original sources on which we are dependent for our knowledge of the work,—the manuscripts, in short,—with especial reference to the different versions which they represent, and the differences between those versions. These differences are very great; they generally amount, in fact, to a complete writing over of the whole work. To describe this matter in detail would require a book rather than an article. I hope to publish such a description some time, but for the present must largely deal in generalities. Furthermore, as to the manuscripts themselves: it would seem mere pedantry to attempt to describe them individually in a scientific way in this article. For such descriptions are of scant

value to the scholar unless accompanied by the actual texts of the manuscripts; and to the non-specialist they would be of no interest anyway. We shall therefore only speak of individual manuscripts occasionally, when one or another of them presents some peculiar feature which is interesting or important in relation to the topic under discussion at the time.

Few story-collections have enjoyed more popularity in India than the *Vikramacarita*.<sup>1</sup> It has come down to us in a number of Sanskrit versions: it is known to have been worked over into several of the modern vernaculars of India, and has been printed in at least three of them,—Hindi, Bengali and Tamil: it was translated into Persian by order of the Emperor Akbar in 1574: and it wandered northward, presumably by way of Tibet, into Mongolian territory, where it is found in a Buddhist form under the name of the Arji-Borji Chan stories. In spite of all this it has been comparatively neglected by Europeans. No European has ever attempted an edition of any Sanskrit version, nor has any Sanskrit version been translated into any European language. Translations have been made into German, French or English of the Persian version,<sup>2</sup> of one Mongolian version,<sup>3</sup> and of one or two Modern Indian versions. But these all differ considerably from the Sanskrit. Some of them—especially the Mongolian—are scarcely to be recognized as the same work. Of the Sanskrit original there are only three or four Hindu editions, most of them now out of print and seemingly difficult of access (I have so far seen only one<sup>4</sup>): they are moreover, I believe, all of one Sanskrit recension, the Southern, which differs materially from the Northern versions.

Most of the current statements about the work are based on the late Prof. Weber's long monograph, "*Ueber die Sindhāsanadvātriṅcikā*", published in the 15th vol. of his *Indische Studien*, Leipzig 1878. This article of nearly 300 pages is indeed at present practically the only printed source of reliable information about the work. Weber gives a detailed account of the

<sup>1</sup> "*Adventures of Vikrama*" is an approximate rendering of the word.

<sup>2</sup> Lescallier, "*Le trône enchanté*", New York, 1817.

<sup>3</sup> Jülg, *Ardschi Bordschi Chan*, in "*Mongolische Märchen*", Innsbruck, 1868. According to Jülg (p. xiii) there exists in MS an unpublished and very different offspring of the same original, in Mongolian.

<sup>4</sup> Jivānanda Vidyāsāgara, Calcutta, 1881. Another appeared at Madras in 1907, but I have not been able to secure a copy.

Jainistic recension, with copious extracts from the original Sanskrit. His work appears to have been hastily done, and is not too accurate in detail. And his view of the relationship of the different versions was, as we shall see, vitiated by certain erroneous postulates. Nevertheless as a *bahnbrechende Arbeit* his work has considerably lightened my labors, and it would be ungrateful not to acknowledge my great indebtedness to it.

The alternate title of the work, *Sinhāsanadvātriṅcakā*, means "Thirty-two Throne Stories". The throne referred to is a marvellous throne supposed to have belonged originally to the god Indra, and to have been presented by him to the famous Vikrama (also called Vikramāditya or Vikramārka).<sup>1</sup> This personage was according to Hindu tradition a king of Mālava (Malwa) who ruled over an extensive part of India, and who founded an era, the so-called Vikrama era (beginning 57 B. C.), which is one of the best-known Indian eras of time-reckoning. In this paper we shall not discuss the complicated question as to what historic basis there may be for the figure of Vikrama. Certainly most of the things told of him are legends pure and simple. The important thing for our present purpose is that he has become a sort of King Arthur of India, who serves as a type of a noble and righteous emperor. The stories of our collection, which tell of the alleged deeds of Vikrama, are represented as told by thirty-two statues (*puttalikā*)<sup>2</sup> on the divine throne to a much later king of Mālava called Bhoja. Bhoja is with much plausibility identified with Bhoja Paramāra of Dhārā (1010-1053 A. D.). Weber conjectured that our work may actually have been composed at the court of this Bhoja and in his honor: and the suggestion seems by no means improbable, though it would be hard to prove it.

We know nothing as to the authorship of the work. The manuscripts name various personages, some manifestly impossible, and none at all probable. All we can assume as likely is that in some cases the names of the *redactors* of one or another recension are correctly reported by the manuscripts of the particular recension. Thus the Bengal recension is persistently

<sup>1</sup> The two latter forms are compounds, both meaning "Sun of Valor": the form Vikrama is simply a shortened form of the name. The three forms are used quite interchangeably in all texts.

<sup>2</sup> Whence the work is also called *Dvātriṅcatputtalikā*, or "Thirty-two Statue Stories"; so in Jivānanda's edition.

attributed to a Vararuci, and the Jainistic version to a Ksemaṅkara Muni, of whom we know nothing else. But these names occur only in the colophons to manuscripts of a single version each, and there is no reason for attributing to either of them the authorship of the original work.<sup>1</sup> Of equally little weight for the work as a whole seems to me the statement also found in Jainistic manuscripts that the work was translated from the Mahārāṣṭri Prakrit into Sanskrit. Possibly the Jainistic version was really a back-rendering from a Prakrit version, now lost: or possibly the tradition is a pure fiction suggested by the fact that certain other well-known story-collections, as the Kathāsaritsāgara and other offshoots of the Bṛhatkathā, were reported to have been based on Prakrit originals. At any rate the question concerns only the Jainistic and dependent versions, not the work as a whole: for the tradition of the Prakrit origin is found only in MSS. of this class. It may be said that the Jainistic version is sufficiently different from the orthodox versions to make it quite likely that there was some such intermediate stage between them.

As to the date of the composition, the likely identification of our Bhoja with Bhoja Paramāra would place it not earlier than the 11th century. There is no internal evidence which in any way makes this unlikely. Quite a number of Sanskrit literary works are alluded to, but most of them considerably antedate this period.<sup>2</sup>

Before going further we shall summarize briefly the story of the book.<sup>3</sup>

#### OUTLINE OF THE STORY.

(*Introduction*). The goddess Parvatī asks her consort Īiva to narrate some interesting and edifying tale: and the god agrees to tell of the noble deeds of Vikrama.

<sup>1</sup> Weber was misled by his MSS. S and C, which as I shall show below, though not at bottom Jainistic, borrowed their conclusions from a Jainistic source, into thinking that the name of Ksemaṅkara Muni occurred in other than Jainistic manuscripts. See p. 264 f.

<sup>2</sup> The Vetālapañcaviṅśati must have been known to the author (see p. 254). Somadeva's work, which was perhaps nearly contemporary, is not referred to: neither is Kṣemendra's. Weber's tentative suggestion that the Jainistic version's "Kṣemaṅkara Muni" may be the same as Kṣemendra seems to me scarcely worth recording.

<sup>3</sup> The following outline follows in general the Southern recension.



(*Frame Story*). In the city of Ujjayinī<sup>1</sup> there once lived a king named Bhartṛhari. His chief queen, Anaṅgasenā by name, was very beautiful, and the king was deeply in love with her.

Now there was at that time in the city a certain very poor Brahmin, who by long devotions won the favor of the goddess Durgā. She appeared to him and offered him a wish, and he asked for exemption from old age and death. The goddess then gave him a fruit, and told him that upon eating it he should become ageless and immortal. But afterwards the Brahmin regretted his choice: for, he reflected, he could only be consigned to an eternity of poverty. So it occurred to him that he could do no better service to mankind as well as to himself than by giving the fruit to the king: for the king was noble and generous as well as rich, and would be sure to do much good to humanity if he were ageless and immortal. The Brahmin therefore took the fruit and gave it to Bhartṛhari.

But the king reflected that if he should become immortal himself, he must outlive Anaṅgasenā: and being so deeply in love with her, he could not endure the thought. So instead of eating the fruit he gave it to the queen.

But it happened that Anaṅgasenā had an intrigue with one of the servants of the royal household; and she preferred to give the fruit to her lover. In the same way it passed through several other hands, and finally was brought again to the king. When he recognized it Bhartṛhari summoned his consort, and swearing a great oath forced her to confess. When he had traced the whole history of the fruit, the good king was so overcome with sorrow and disgust at the faithlessness of human beings in general and women in particular that he lost all interest in worldly affairs and determined to become a forest ascetic. So he abdicated his kingdom, and his brother Vikrama reigned in his stead.<sup>2</sup>

King Vikrama soon showed himself to be a noble and mighty ruler. He reduced the whole earth under his sway, performed

<sup>1</sup> The modern Ujain, in Mālava (west-central India). In the Jainistic and dependent versions the city is called Avantī.

<sup>2</sup> According to some versions Vikrama did not at once succeed his brother, but won the throne by proving that he was the only person capable of subduing a *vetāla* or demon which had infested the royal house. This *vetāla* then became a kind of familiar for Vikrama, rendering him aid on many occasions.

many heroic deeds, and at the same time exhibited great devotion to his moral and religious duties. On one occasion he nearly lost his life through too great readiness to grant a petition. A treacherous *yogin* ascetic obtained from the king a promise to assist him in the performance of a secret magic rite. Vikrama was required to go by night to a graveyard and take down a corpse which he was to find hanging on a tree there. This he must carry, in perfect silence, to the place where the *yogin* was awaiting him. Now the corpse was inhabited by a *vetāla* ("vampire" or demon), which began to speak as the king took down the corpse. The *vetāla* told the king a story, at the end of which the king made some comment: thereupon the corpse disappeared from his shoulder and returned to the tree again. This was repeated 24 times: but the twenty-fifth time the king kept silent. The *vetāla* rewarded his steadfastness by warning him against the *yogin*, who was plotting to kill him. In this very summary form, and without relating the 25 stories told to Vikrama by the *vetāla*, our work presents the episode which is told in full by the well-known story-collection called the *Vetālapañcaviṃśati* ("Twenty-five *Vetāla*-stories").

At this time Vikrama paid a visit to the court of Indra, king of the gods, upon Indra's invitation, to decide which of the two nymphs, Rambhā and Urvaçī, was the better dancer. He gave the palm to Urvaçī, and defended his decision so plausibly as to win the admiration of Indra, who gave him his own throne as a reward. This throne was a very marvellous one, of divine workmanship, and the seat was supported by 32 statuettes, female figures wrought with all kinds of precious stones. Vikrama took it back to earth and set it up with due ceremony in his capital of Ujjayinī.

Towards the end of the reign of Vikrama there was born in the city of Pratiṣṭhāna a boy named Çalivāhana. His birth is said to have been miraculous, and various omens informed Vikrama that through this Çalivāhana he was destined to meet death. Vikrama gathered an army and marched against Pratiṣṭhāna, but by the miraculous aid of the serpent-god Çeṣa, who was reputed to be the father of Çalivāhana, the army was routed and Vikrama was killed by a blow from Çalivāhana's staff. After his death no one was found worthy to mount the divine throne, and the ministers buried it in the earth.

Many years after this King Bhoja reigned in the city of Dhārā, the successor of the old Ujjayinī or Avantī. The field where the throne was buried had come into the possession of a certain Brahmin, who had built a platform upon the mound in the center, for the purpose of scaring away birds from his field. Now it appeared that whenever this Brahmin mounted on the platform, he seemed to be inspired with the greatest generosity and benevolence, although at other times he was conspicuously mean and selfish. When King Bhoja's attention was drawn to this circumstance he bought the field which seemed to have such unusual qualities, and caused the mound to be opened: whereupon the wonderful throne was brought to light. The king was delighted, and gave orders to move it to the city: but it could not be moved until, on the advice of a minister, Bhoja performed sacrifices to the gods on the spot. This gives occasion for a long digression, in which the minister illustrates the value to a king of a wise counsellor by a story which is otherwise met with very frequently in India: it is perhaps most familiar from the *Kathāsaritsāgara*, where it appears as the story of the wise minister Bahuçruta, who saved the Brahmin Vararuci from the unjust jealousy of his master King Nanda.

After this King Bhoja moved the throne to his city and set it up with great pomp in a hall of a thousand columns: and in an auspicious moment he started to mount it. But as soon as he placed his foot upon the head of one of the statuettes, preparatory to ascending the throne, the statue spoke to him with a human voice and said:

King Bhoja, unless thou canst show the like of the nobility, heroism, generosity and other virtues possessed by Vikrama, thou shalt not mount upon this throne.

The king answered:<sup>1</sup> O statue, I can show all the generosity and other virtues of which thou speakest: which one is lacking? Surely I grant so far as I may all things that are asked of me.

(The statue replied): O king, this is not seemly, that with thine own lips thou dost boast of thine own gifts. He who praises his own virtues is verily a base man; but an upright man speaketh not thus. And it is said:

Only a low man speaks of his own virtues and other men's faults: for of his own virtues and other men's faults a righteous

<sup>1</sup> From this point literal translation of the southern version.

man verily will not speak. . . . Hearing the words of the statue King Bhoja was astonished and said: Thou hast spoken truly: he who praises his own virtues is no better than a fool. I made mention of my own virtues: that was indeed wrong. Do thou therefore tell of the nobility of him whose this throne was.

And the statue said:<sup>1</sup> O king, give ear!

(Here follows the first story).

Each story is introduced in like manner by an attempt to mount the throne on the part of Bhoja: each time another statue stops him with the same challenge, and in response to his humble inquiry (he does not again attempt to praise himself) the statue tells a story intended to illustrate the nobility of Vikrama. At the end of each tale the statue again addresses the king: If thou canst show *such* nobility, etc., then mount upon this throne! To which Bhoja does not venture a reply.

At the end of the 32d story all the statues step down from their places, and saluting King Bhoja explain their origin. They were servants of Parvatī and incurred the goddess's jealous displeasure by casting coquettish glances at her consort Īva (or as one version has it, it was Īva who tried to make advances to them). For this reason they were cursed to become lifeless statues on the throne of Indra, until such time as this throne should have passed through the hands of Vikrama and been discovered by Bhoja. They should then tell to Bhoja the deeds of Vikrama, and thus obtain release. The statues then mount into heaven, having blessed King Bhoja and whosoever else should hear, read or repeat the tales of the Vikramacarita. And king Bhoja reigned long and prosperously.

The Jaina recensions and those that depend on them have a different explanation of the curse of the statues, which seems to me obviously secondary, by reason of its strong religious tinge: the rather unethic original account was made over by the Jainist writers into a tale having a more religious (though to be sure not at all exclusively Jainistic) point. According to this they had been servants of Indra, and were cursed for laughing irreverently at an extremely dirty and ill-kempt ascetic whom they chanced to see one day.

The introduction and frame story occupy a large part—roughly speaking, one-fifth—of the entire work. From an artistic stand-

<sup>1</sup> To this point literal translation of the southern version.

point, or at least from our artistic standpoint, this is also the best part. The stories themselves, considered simply as stories, are, I must say, rather monotonous. I presume this is the reason why Europeans have not yet devoted to the work anything like as much attention as its importance in Indian literature would seem to warrant. The best stories in the book are to a large extent found in the introduction.

This brings us to another question. From what point of view are we to look at such a work as the *Vikramacarita*? What ideas were uppermost in the mind of its composer? What effects did he desire to produce in the minds of his hearers, and by what means did he strive to produce them?

To the average Westerner such questions may sound unnecessary. Folklore, to our minds, generally means simply folklore: stories are stories: their prime purpose, we assume, is to give esthetic pleasure to the audience. We recognize, to be sure, the possibility, and even perhaps now and then the desirability, of mixing in a little sermonizing, but we demand at least that the pill be carefully sugar-coated with an irreproachable literary form. We tolerate, perhaps even admire, Tolstoi, because notwithstanding his theory of the immorality of art he remained to the end, in spite of himself, an artist. But we do not recognize Bellamy's *Looking Backward* as literature.

The Hindu theory—I am speaking now *only* of theory—was wholly different, at least as far as concerns the fable and story<sup>1</sup> literature.

The Hindus have a familiar formula which classifies all human desires and aspirations as directed towards three things: *dharma* or religion, *artha* or worldly advancement, and *kāma* or love. With obvious dependence on this classification, the Jain scholar Haribhadra says in a treatise on the subject (*Samarāicchakahā*, ed. Jacobi, p. 2), that stories are of four kinds, according as they are intended to serve and promote the fulfillment of any one of these three ends, or, fourthly, of more than one of them at the same time. After making due allowance for the Hindu passion

<sup>1</sup> Although the *Vikramacarita*, in its Sanskrit form, contains hardly a trace of beast-fable, it is impossible to make a sharp division between fable and fairy-story in India. Generally speaking the two are inextricably mingled, and the same tendencies and principles, both esthetic and moral, are found in both. Most Hindu collections also include both.



for schematization, it must after all be regarded as significant that Haribhadra does not mention at all the purpose which we should naturally think of as the main object of stories—the entertainment of the audience. He only recognizes practical ends as admissible, or indeed conceivable; for he is dealing descriptively with facts, and is not voicing a theory of his own as to how things *should* be done.

In a general way the ethical and practical character of Hindu stories has always been more or less recognized. The Hindu story collections are called in Sanskrit by the term *nitiśāstra*, which I should translate "textbook of conduct". Hertel<sup>1</sup> gives a somewhat narrower interpretation in this connection of the word *niti*, which I render "conduct". He thinks it is a synonym of *artha*, "worldly advancement", or to quote his own words, "Nutzen, Erwerb": after setting up this equation he goes on to further describe *niti* as "Führung, Betragen, kluge Lebensführung, daher auch List, Klugheit". I agree in general with Hertel's understanding of *niti* (though on the doubtful point as to whether it may mean "List", trickery, I do not feel like expressing an opinion). But I am not ready to agree that a *niti*-textbook is necessarily an unmoral Machiavelli, simply a compendium of shrewd and worldly wisdom for the practical conduct of affairs, whether public or private. This may be what the *Pañcatantra* is: but it does not at all describe the *Vikramacarita*, which is also certainly a *nitiśāstra*.<sup>2</sup> In this book at least *artha* is distinctly subordinated to *dharma*, moral and religious conduct, which so completely occupies the center of the stage that the *artha* or Machiavellian side of *niti* is at times an almost negligible quantity.

The *Vikramacarita* is, then, a textbook of conduct, intended to show by precept and example how to live. The example is furnished by the hero of the story, King Vikrama himself. He is held up to the world as a pattern of right living,—particularly, of course, right living for kings, since he was himself a great emperor, and some of his most marked virtues, such as his unbounded generosity and his habit of never refusing anything

<sup>1</sup> See his *Tantrākhyāyika*, *Einleitung*, pp. 6 ff. This illuminating and admirable treatise contains the latest and best resumé of the general concepts of Hindu story literature.

<sup>2</sup> It is definitely so described in the introduction to at least one MS, and is certainly regarded as such in all.

to a suppliant,<sup>1</sup> are distinctly kingly virtues. So that we find after all that the Vikramacarita sets out to be more than anything else a Mirror for Magistrates, just like the Pañcatantra, except that the Pañcatantra is more worldly and political, while our work is moral,—both these things, however, being different phases of the comprehensive Hindu term *niti*, conduct. At the same time the Vikramacarita, again like the Pañcatantra, by no means limits itself to the sphere of royal activities. There is hardly a phase of every-day life that is not touched on to some extent. One very interesting little tale<sup>2</sup> points out the evils of gambling. In another<sup>3</sup> young men are admonished to devote themselves to study instead of frivolous or immoral pursuits. Sometimes a moral question is discussed from both sides, pro and con, the discussion taking the form of a debate between two characters in the story. For instance, in the 14th story, a wandering *yogin* meets the king in a distant kingdom and reproaches him for the impolitic act of leaving his kingdom in the hands of ministers, who might do—the Lord knows what with it. The king replies that all such things are in the hands of fate, against which there is no use in contending, and illustrates his point by an interjected story of a king who successively lost and won a kingdom by divine will alone, and without any effort on his own part.<sup>4</sup> This is the only instance in our work, with the exception of one case in the introduction, of that boxing in of stories within stories which is so common in the Pañcatantra.

Whatever the stories may begin with, they almost always end with some astonishing act of generosity or self-sacrifice on the part of Vikrama. The monotonously regular type is as follows. The king hears of some person in need or distress, usually of a supernatural character—persecution by a demon, refusal of a deity to grant a boon, or the like. The god, demon, or other supernatural agent demands a human life as condition precedent to granting immunity or whatever favor is desired. Vikrama offers his own life, usually by starting to cut his own throat, in several instances by jumping into a caldron of boiling oil, occa-

<sup>1</sup> In the 6th story he gives an enormous gift to a lying ascetic on the strength of a story which the king knows to be false, simply to avoid the sin of refusing a suppliant.

<sup>2</sup> Story 27.

<sup>3</sup> Story 9.

<sup>4</sup> Another instance of such a moral debate is found in the twelfth story, which is translated below.

sionally by other means. The deity is appeased and either checks his attempt on his own life, or gives his life back to him after he has taken it. Usually some magic amulet or other article of value is given him in addition: this he always gives away to some beggar whom he meets on his way back to the city. Occasionally he shows more heroic qualities by fighting with and killing demons who are molesting some one, generally a woman. In a few cases his nobility is only exhibited by an enormous recompense for some trifling service. The Jainistic recensions are particularly monotonous in their recital of case after case of this kind of thing: they are so wholly absorbed in the moral side of the matter that they seem as if purposely to emphasize the nobility of Vikrama by reciting the various instances of it as nearly in the same terms as possible. The best known Brahministic recension, the Southern, is probably a truer representative of the original, and is superior to the Jainistic in this respect: it shows, in fact, considerable skill in giving variety in detail to a monotonous central theme. But even here it is always evident that the principal effort is not primarily to interest the reader, but to present in Vikrama the picture of an ideal prince, a model for real princes to shape themselves after. The prime virtue of Vikrama, the one most constantly harped upon, is his *āudārya*—a term which is perhaps more closely approached by "nobility" than by any other English term. It is the abstract noun to the adjective *udāra*, which means exalted, lofty, noble. It is thus a sufficiently vague term to be made to include about all virtues which ought properly to be found in a king, including many of the distinctly chivalrous virtues, notably protection of the weak and lavish generosity. Next in frequency of occurrence come *dhāirya*, manliness, *satva*, courage, and *paropakāra*, general benevolence, doing good to others, charity. Another virtue which is occasionally mentioned is *gāmbhīrya*, which means literally depth, and might be supposed to mean dignity, composure, constancy or the like: but as used in the *Vikramacarita* it seems to mean hardly anything else than generosity.

An exception to the ordinary run is the 24th story, which is a long and compound story containing at least two originally independent themes. The second of them is another account of Vikrama's contest with his rival *Çalivāhana*, already referred to in the introduction. In this case however the account is con-

siderably altered. Vikrama himself is not injured in the battle, but his army is struck lifeless by the power of the serpent-god *Çeşa*, the father of *Çalivāhana*. Vikrama thereupon by a long and severe penance propitiates *Çeşa* and obtains from him nectar (*amṛta*) with which to revive his army. *Çalivāhana* sends a Brahmin to meet him: the Brahmin asks Vikrama to give him the nectar, and Vikrama, although he knows that the man is a messenger from his enemy, gives it to him, rather than refuse a favor asked. This *Çalivāhana*<sup>1</sup> appears in many places in Hindu legendary history, and is persistently represented as the enemy of *Vikramāditya*, and as finally overcoming him. He also, like Vikrama, is said to have founded an era, to wit, the *Çaka* era, which begins with 78 A. D. In spite of the obvious impossibility of reconciling these two statements with the tradition above alluded to, that our Vikrama founded the Vikrama era of 57 B. C., there was long supposed to be historical ground for the tradition.

#### VERSIONS.

There are known to be in existence about seventy manuscripts of the *Vikramacarita*.<sup>2</sup>

Of these, seven are in Germany, one in Denmark, two in Austria, about a dozen in England, one<sup>3</sup> is now in the writer's own possession, and the rest are in India. I collated the German and Danish manuscripts during the summer of 1911. Nearly all the others which belong in Europe have been lent to me,—the English ones through the great kindness of Dr. Thomas, librarian of the India Office, who has also helped to secure for me the loan of a number of the MSS. from India. To him my thanks are due in an unusual degree. I already have collated enough manuscripts to be in good control of the texts of the three most important versions (I, III, and IV below), besides having seen one MS. each of the other two. It is of course possible that still other versions may turn up among the manuscripts which I have not as yet seen. There is some doubt in my mind as to whether the so-called Vararuci version (V, see below), of which I know as yet only one manuscript, is sufficiently distinct from the Jain-

<sup>1</sup> Also called *Sālavāhana*, *Sāta*- etc., etc.; there are numerous variations of the name.

<sup>2</sup> Nearly all these can be found listed in Aufrecht's *Catalogus Catalogorum*.

<sup>3</sup> Which originally formed part of the Hiersemann Collection of Indian MSS, offered for sale in Leipzig.

istic, on which it is evidently based, to warrant its classification as a distinct version. Certainly most of its text is practically the same as that of the *recensio jainica*. I have, however, for the present followed Weber in recognizing the division.

#### I. THE SOUTHERN PROSE RECENSION.<sup>1</sup>

There is little doubt, it seems to me, that this comes closer to the original Vikramacarita than any other text as yet known to me. It seems to be fairly definitely connected with the south of India, where, in fact, only this and the following (metrical) recension seem to be known. Many of its MSS. are written on palm-leaves and in alphabets characteristic of South India (Telugu, Grantha, Nandināgarī). It is this fact that makes me hesitate to believe that this *is* the original, out and out. It is contrary to our usual experience to find such works originating in the south. On the other hand, there is some reason to suppose that there once existed a full Northern Brahmanical version, now lost, which was the basis of the abbreviated version (III). This seems to be based on a version not quite the same as our Southern version, though very much closer to it than to the Jainistic version.

The Southern version is certainly the best from an artistic point of view. It is composed in a free, flowing and generally simple style, mainly in prose, but extensively interlarded with sententious verses of the sort so common in Hindu story literature—proverbial saws intended both to point a moral and, incidentally, to adorn a tale. There are a few cases in which we find a verse thrown into the midst of the story, carrying on the narrative. This usually occurs at what Prof. Bloomfield has called in another connection "summit moments" of the story. Thus at the end of the Introduction, when the first of the statues addresses Bhoja, she does so in verse—which emphasizes the startling solemnity of the occasion.

A high degree of skill is often shown in the working out of the details of the narrative. It would be a mistake, however, to suppose that this less single devotion to the moral purpose indicates that this version is more secondary than the other versions. The same mistake was made by the scholars of former times who supposed that the Buddhist Jātakas were more primitive than the Pāñcatantra, among other reasons because they were often stronger on the moral than on the artistic

<sup>1</sup> To this belongs the Jivānanda edition.



side. We know now that Hindu story-books at their best are extremely high examples of the art of story-telling, even though at the same time their professed purpose remains just as truly a moral one. And in fact the Southern version is fully as good an example of a true *nitiśāstra* as the Jainistic: it would be possible to quote many cases in which it takes much greater pains to prove a moral point which the Jainistic version merely touches on in passing, or even omits altogether. It is, by the way, much longer than the Jainistic version (nearly twice as long).

## II. THE SOUTHERN METRICAL VERSION.

Known to Weber through his MS. T. It is written entirely in verse. The version it is based on was evidently essentially the same as the Southern prose recension just alluded to. There are however many differences of detail, some serious abbreviations of the narrative, and at least one long interpolation, the story of the Weaver as Viṣṇu (see below). This version is so obviously secondary in every way that it is of little importance for our present purpose.

## III. THE SHORT (NORTHERN) RECENSION.

Represented by Weber's C and O, and by S in its first part; also by our L (a Leipzig MS.) and by a MS. from Vienna. The version on which it is based is also essentially the same as the Southern version: but most of the book, and especially the 32 individual stories themselves (as distinguished from the introduction and frame-story), are very much shortened, so much so in fact, that only the barest skeleton of most of them is left, and they are often not even intelligible without reference to one of the fuller texts. It is indeed a very curious performance, this deliberate reducing of the book to a mere collection of bones, which fairly rattle with dryness. Weber was without doubt on the right track when he said of MS. C of this recension (p. 225 f.): "diese Abkürzung trifft speziell den je ersten Theil jeder Erzählung, der von den Abenteuern Vikrama's berichtet, während der jedesmalige Schluss, der von seiner Grossmuth . . . handelt, hier und da sogar ziemlich breit getreten wird". In other words, it is an extreme instance of utter devotion to the moral purpose, resulting in an almost ascetic mortifi-

cation of the story. The way the introduction is treated bears this out. For though, as I have said, it occupies proportionately much more space than the stories themselves, this space is only to a slight extent occupied with the telling of the events which happened. It is mostly composed of an enormous quantity of sententious and moral verses, taken from no one knows where (they mostly do not appear in the other versions), or perhaps to some extent original. (It is a curious fact, in contrast to this, that the 32 stories in this recension contain almost no verses.) Let it be particularly noted that this *reductio ad absurdum* of morality as the purpose of Hindu story-telling is patently the work, not of a Jaina or a Buddhist, but of an orthodox Hindu.

As a matter of fact, the MSS. of this recension themselves give evidence that the copyists were sometimes offended by the threadbareness of the work. In fact, they did not hesitate to try their hand at improving the text at times. Weber's MS. O seems to have been quite arbitrary in some of its changes, to judge by Weber's account of its contents (I have not been able to see it: its custodians, I am informed, are not willing to lend MSS). Our MS. L and the fragmentary Berlin MS. C (which only contains the last part, from Story 15 to the end) appear to be freest from such secondary influences: yet L contains passages seemingly written over from some MS. of the Jainistic recension, with considerable verbal modifications: and C is peculiar in that at the end of its text proper its writer, evidently being conscious of the fact that the story of the end was quite differently told by the Jainas, goes straight ahead and tells the conclusion over again in the exact language of the Jainistic recension. This MS. therefore has two complete conclusions, one that belonging to its own version, the other that of the Jainistic version. The course of events here is so superficially obvious that it is hard to understand how Weber could have been blind to what took place. Yet he (p. 188) tries to argue from the appearance of the verse naming Kṣemamkara as author, found at the end of the *second* (Jainistic) conclusion of C, that this verse was *not* peculiar to the Jainistic version, because C "nicht zur Jaina-Recension gehört"! The fact is, of course, that this section of C *is* Jainistic.

Weber makes the same mistake, and in the same connection, about the conclusion of his MS. S, speaking of it as non-Jainistic. The facts here are somewhat more complicated, but after all perfectly evident; one need hardly do more than study care-

fully Weber's own data about S, and observe the fact that all through Weber's critical apparatus for the Jainistic version, after the end of the first story, he quotes the variants from S as well as those from the pure Jainistic MSS.—which are as a rule hardly better representatives of their own text than S is, in this part of the book! It is obvious that S is a composite MS. The introduction goes according to the short recension, though with here and there (as in L, see above) an interpolation from a Jainistic MS. But after the end of the first story this cut-and-dried version was abandoned for the more literary Jainistic version,—although not entirely, for there are spots at which the writer inserts into the Jainistic text fragments from the version he started with. He also now and then modifies specifically Jainist passages to suit his own (Brahministic) prejudices. The fact that he was not a Jaina probably prevented him from throwing over altogether the threadbare Brahministic version with which he started. At any rate, from the end of the first story on to the end of the work, as well as in some places in the introduction, S is for practical purposes a Jainistic MS. Its readings are as close to the Jainist text, in these sections, as are those of several MSS. which Weber rightly classifies as Jainistic out-and-out. It is therefore wholly wrong to speak of the verse at its conclusion as coming from a non-Jainistic recension, as Weber does (*vide supra*).<sup>1</sup>

#### IV. THE JAINISTIC RECENSION.

Of this some incidental information has been given while dealing with the other recensions. Thus we have seen that it is much shorter than the Southern. Its method of telling the stories is, in fact, largely determined by the concentration of the interest on the noble and self-sacrificing acts of Vikrama himself, somewhat to the neglect of other details in the story. The first part of each story, though not so neglected as in the Short Version, which almost leaves it out, is told seemingly as a necessary prelude, more or less, and is not enlarged upon in the free and natural way which characterizes the Southern text. The number of

<sup>1</sup> Still more to say (p. 221) that the 32 stories in their Jain. form (because borrowed verbally from a Jain. source into S) "form the ancient kernel of the original work"!

verses<sup>1</sup> in these parts is much smaller, and the whole style gives the impression of being somewhat cramped and consciously restricted.

Another peculiarity of this version is that nearly every one of the 32 stories is either begun or ended with an apparently original verse, or sometimes two, in which the chief points of the story from the narrator's point of view (especially the noble deeds of Vikrama) are briefly summed up. As Weber says, this is somewhat analogous to the *argumenta* often placed at the beginning of Latin comedies. As a rather imperfect Hindu analogon I would call attention to the verses with which the Pañcatantra fables are generally introduced, and which are then repeated at the end to emphasize the "moral". The parallel is imperfect, as I say: the Pañcatantra verses are skillful artistic devices for weaving each story into its setting. Of this there is nothing in the Vikramacarita: the stories all stand baldly by themselves, and are not, like the Pañcatantra fables, even *supposed* each to fit and illustrate a certain definite occasion or emergency. For this reason there is no occasion for the "*argumenta*": and in fact, I am not of the opinion that they belonged to the original. They only appear in the Jain. and dependent versions (Vararuci, MS. S), and have every appearance of being secondary. It seems not unlikely that they were meant to imitate the catch-verses of the Pañcatantra<sup>2</sup> fables, and were made up and inserted for that purpose by the redactor of the Jain. archetype.—The first half of our stories have the "*argumentum*" at the beginning, the last half at the end, and a few lack it altogether. There is no apparent reason for this variation.

I have already mentioned the fact that the Jain. conclusion is different from that of the other texts. The general run of the 32 stories is, however, the same. The differences are for the most part purely verbal (in this regard very marked, however, amounting to a complete rewriting of the story). The main themes are the same, and the incidents and motives, though now and

<sup>1</sup> The Jainistic version contains many verses in the Jaina Prakrit, although most of its verses, and all those which also appear in the other versions, are in the Sanskrit language. The Prakrit verses are probably for the most part quotations from sacred or semi-sacred Jaina texts. In some cases this is definitely stated. The narrative (prose) portion of the work is wholly in Sanskrit.

<sup>2</sup> I use the term Pañcatantra in a loose sense, as typifying the Hindu beast-fable literature. Similar verses are of course found in connection with fables wherever they are found in India, e. g. in the Jātakas.

then different, are seldom radically so. The 1st, 29th, 31st and 32d stories of the Jain. are, however, wholly different: the last three are quite new stories, and very poor ones at that,—almost certainly secondary additions,<sup>1</sup> and by no means improvements. The first story in the orthodox versions is really not a story, but merely a brief introductory eulogy of Vikrama. This evidently did not please the Jain redactor: he felt that there ought to be a story, and accordingly transferred to this place the story of the jealous king Nanda, his wise minister, and his Brahmin "*guru*". The story is manifestly out of place here, and belongs where it is found in the Southern version, in the introduction, where it is told to King Bhoja by his minister to illustrate the value of a minister's advice. In that position it has point: in the Jain. version, however, it is dragged in by the heels, apropos of nothing, and evidently only for the purpose of filling what the redactor felt as a gap in the first story.

It is the introduction to the Jain. version, however, which shows the most marked variation from the orthodox ones. In the first place, a large section is devoted to an entirely new insertion. In this Vikrama is represented as being converted to Jainism by the Jain. saint and teacher Siddhasena Divākara, who performs various miracles which first astonish and finally persuade the king. Siddhasena then lives at the court for a long time under the patronage of the king. There are other sources of Jainistic tradition which also bring Vikrama into relations with this Siddhasena,<sup>2</sup> and in such a way as to indicate a probable genetic relation between them and this section of the Vikramacarita. The Jainas and Buddhists were fond of thus adopting and "converting" the famous heroes of Brahministic history and legend:

<sup>1</sup> The reasons for the substitution of these for the original stories are not hard to discover, but it would take too long to go into them here.

<sup>2</sup> One, which I have discovered, may be mentioned as being among the less familiar sources; it is the *Prabhāvakacarita*, a book of lives of Jainistic saints, ed. H. M. Sharmā, Bombay 1909: p. 95. (Chapter 8, verses 61-66 and 75-77.) Two incidents of the Siddhasena chapter of the Vikr. are here told in very summary form, but of two *different* kings, one called *Vikramārka*, the other *Vikrama*! It is clear from the narrative that they are not supposed to be the same. At first sight it would seem that this must be a secondary confusion, due to the various names under which King Vikrama goes. I shall not discuss the matter now, but will content myself with mentioning the interesting fact that one verse from the Jain. Rec. of the Vikr. (Weber 30) appears also in the *Prabhāv.* (8: 64), with only one single variant (*udbhṛta-* for *ucchṛita-*).



Rāma, the hero of the Rāmāyaṇa, was treated in like manner by the Buddhists, see Jacobi, *Das Rāmāyaṇa*, p. 86. I would not attempt to read any deeper meaning into the circumstance.

There are other parts of the Introduction in which the Jain. Rec. differs from the others. For instance, the scene in Indra's heaven, in which Vikrama decides the dancing contest between Rambhā and Urvaṇī, is omitted altogether, evidently because dancing was disapproved of by the Jainas (as by the Buddhists). This removes the original motivation of the presentation of the throne to Vikrama by Indra (as a reward for his wisdom as shown in that decision). The Jain. Rec. is compelled to patch this up in what seems to the reader a very lame manner: Indra, it is said, observed the virtues and noble acts of Vikrama, and presented him with his throne in token of his admiration. Evidently the orthodox version is here the original.

The most striking difference of all, however, is the following. The *order of events* in the Introduction is wholly changed. Instead of beginning in chronological order with Bhartṛhari, Vikrama, and then Bhoja, we find ourselves at the very outset in Dhārā, the capital of Bhoja. The king discovers the magic throne, essentially in the same way as in the other versions, and the story of what had gone before (Bhartṛhari and Anaṅgasenā, the reign of Vikrama, etc.) is put into the mouth of the first statue, who tells it to King Bhoja when he first attempts to mount the throne! This gives the first statue an entirely disproportionate amount of talking: for she also has a long story to tell (the Nanda story, referred to above), which is clearly recognized, moreover, as *her* "number", her share of the 32 stories: the introduction does not take the place thereof. The change is not successful as an artistic device, although I am inclined to think it was introduced for artistic reasons.

Namely: it was a habit with the Hindus to produce a certain external unity in their works of fiction by putting them into a sort of dramatically unified form. The Mahābhārata, the Pāñcatantra, the Kathāsaritsāgara, and so on—all the great works in this department of literature are supposed to have been *told* by somebody to somebody else. The Vikramacarita itself, in all the orthodox versions, is told by Śiva to his consort. In the Jain. version this of course had to be dropped. That left the work without any such uniform "binding-together". But the major part of the work was already unified by another bond of the same

sort: the 32 stories themselves, comprising perhaps four-fifths of the book, were all told to Bhoja—if not by the same person, at least by the same group of individuals. It seems to me not unlikely that it was the desire to throw the matter contained in the introduction into this same binding that prompted the change above alluded to. As a result of it, practically the whole book, after the opening scene, is told to Bhoja by one or another of the 32 statues. At least, I throw out this suggestion for what it is worth. If it cannot stand on its own inherent probability, I admit I have no further support for it. But I am unable to conceive any other reason for the change: and the matter is not helped, moreover, by assuming with Weber that the Jain. Rec. is the original, and the orthodox order secondary. There is still no apparent reason for such a change being made.<sup>1</sup>

Not all the MSS. classed as Jainistic are simply reproductions of the standard Jain. text. Thus Weber's MS. H is an abbreviated text, like the Short Brahministic Recension, only based on the Jain. Rec. Its abbreviation is, however, not so drastic as that of the other. In fact the narrative portions of the text are on the whole quite well preserved: it is the verses which suffer the most.—The case is different with MS. K. This is clearly a Brahminized version of the Jain. text. Although speaking generally it follows its original literally, with only verbal variants and no more of them than most of the Jain. MSS. show, it deliberately changes all specifically Jainistic references, making them Brahministic: or sometimes, as in the Siddhasena chapter of the introduction, it omits whole passages which are characteristically Jainistic and do not lend themselves well to this sort of proselyting. The good Brahmin who did the job was more pious than clever: the changes made are at times very labored, and often the original shows through clearly.—The same thing, more or less, was attempted by the author of the Vararuci re-

<sup>1</sup>Weber rightly discards his own tentative suggestion that the Jainistic order, beginning with Bhoja, may be a form of flattery of Bhoja himself (the version where it appears being assumed to be the work of a writer at his court). In the first place, the Rec. Jain. refers to Bhoja as belonging to the past (and is the only version which does so). In the second place, the orthodox versions contain more fulsome flattery of Bhoja than does the Jainistic.—In passing it may be noted that a number of the secondary (non-Sanskrit) versions have the same transposition of the introduction. To discuss the meaning of this would involve us in the whole complicated problem of the interrelation of the versions, which I must postpone for the present.

cension, and by the writer of S in those parts which he took from the Jain. text. They, however, do not otherwise keep so closely to the Jain. original as does K.

#### V. THE VARARUCI OR BENGAL VERSION.

This is evidently an adaptation either of the Jainistic version as we now have it, or of its archetype. It agrees almost verbally with it in most parts, and shows clear traces of its original Jainistic character. The good Brahministic redactor modified or omitted most of the specifically Jainistic passages, trying to adapt them to Brahministic prejudices. His art, however, was not the equal of his religious zeal, and he left many evidences of the original. This seems to me to show the improbability of Weber's and Hertel's assumption that all the other versions were based on Jainistic sources. To change a Jainistic into an orthodox work so completely as to leave no traces of its origin was not so easy a task as these scholars seem to have supposed, and certainly it required much more care and precision than the average Hindu redactor possessed. If the orthodox recensions had originated in this way, they would be almost sure to show it in superficially obvious ways, as does the Var. version, and as does even the remote French translation of the Bengali rendering (see below). Some name of a Jainistic saint or the like would have stuck in the text, somewhere.—This recension might also be called the Eastern or Bengal recension, since it was evidently connected with that part of India. Several of its MSS are written in the Bengali alphabet, and it was obviously from this Sanskrit version that the Bengali version was translated, to judge from Féer's French rendering of the Bengali, which in many parts might pass for a translation of the Sanskrit text of the Var. version. (The changes are mainly artistic embellishments: there is one new story added.) In one or two cases it still retains in the text the names of Jainistic saints, although the context shows that neither the pious Bengali Hindu nor his French translator had any idea who these personages really were. Féer, who professes himself quite ignorant of the Skt. *Vikramacarita*, gives us no information about the origin of the book he translated except that it was worked over from the Skt., and that its "author" (i. e. the Bengali redactor) was named Mrtyumjaya.

## RELATIONSHIP OF THE VERSIONS TO EACH OTHER.

I have already had occasion to say that it seems to me that the Brahministic versions are more closely related to the original text than the Jainistic version and texts dependent on it. Owing to the large amount of space required, and to the highly technical character of the evidence, it has not seemed feasible to do more in this preliminary paper than to hint at the reasons which I think I have found for this belief. They will be presented in full at some future time. Inasmuch, however, as both Weber and Hertel, two eminent scholars, and the only two who have publicly expressed opinions on the subject so far as I know, have taken the opposite view, it seems to be my duty to consider now the reasons they have advanced and show why, in my opinion, there is at least no sound reason for holding, with them, that the original *Vikramacarita* was written by a Jaina. This is, I fully realize, quite a different matter from proving that the contrary is true: and all I can at present ask of scholars is that they will consider the question undecided until such time as I shall be able to publish my reasons for holding the position I take.

As for Weber, the main reason he has for giving priority to the Jainistic recension is expressed by him I. St. XV: 186, where he says: "The devout ethical character which pervades the work seems to me to point directly to a Buddhistic, or rather to a Jainistic, origin". This sentence implies two propositions which were current in Weber's time, but which are now usually admitted to be radical errors, to wit:

a) that the Jains were a Buddhist sect. It is now commonplace knowledge that they were a quite independent body, though founded about the same time (probably somewhat earlier), and holding similar doctrines in many ways (these doctrines, however, can mostly be paralleled nearly as well from Brahministic as from Buddhistic sources).

b) that there was a sharp division between the Jains and Buddhists as writers on the one hand and the orthodox Hindus on the other, the former being characterized by a much greater preoccupation with moral questions: and that the Hindu story literature, because of the preponderance of such questions in it, was largely if not wholly Buddhistic or Jainistic in origin.

On this the venerable French scholar Barth said in 1889 (*Méhusine*, IV, 558): "People have thus become accustomed more and more to admit as an axiom that all this literature (*viz.* Hindu

stories and fables) is of Buddhistic origin. *In my opinion it would hardly be a more serious error to maintain the opposite thesis of a çivaitic or tantric origin.*<sup>1</sup> The past of India does not offer such clearcut divisions. To introduce them here is to judge of this past with our occidental habits of mind, and it is furthermore markedly to exaggerate the rôle and the originality of communities (i. e. the Buddhists and Jainas) which after all were only Hindu sects".

This expresses so concisely and admirably the position which I believe is now generally held by scholars, in theory at least, that to add to it would be to detract from it—*sit venia verbis*. If the truth of it be granted, the bottom drops out of Weber's argument at once. In other words, the ethical character of the *Vikramacarita* is no more characteristic of Jainistic than of orthodox story literature.

Weber was also misled by his failure to see the true nature of some of his manuscripts, notably S (see above, p. 264 f.). Assuming this to be a fair representative of a non-Jainistic version, and finding traces of Jainism in it, he argued that the original work must have been Jainistic. Since the greater part of the composite manuscript S was copied from a Jainistic archetype (a fact which seems to me superficially obvious, and which I shall have occasion to show at a later time), no such argument is allowable. The real Brahministic recensions (Nos. I-III) show no such traces of Jainism, in my opinion. I shall now try to show that Hertel<sup>2</sup> was wrong in holding a contrary opinion.

<sup>1</sup> Italics mine.

<sup>2</sup> In his article "Ueber die Jaina-Recensionen des Pañcatantra", in *Ber. u. Verh. d. kgl. sächs. Ges. d. Wiss., ph-hist. Kl.*, 54: 23ff., especially 115ff.—It is only fair to call attention to the fact that Hertel's remarks on this subject were not only made some time ago, but did not constitute, perhaps, an important part of the subject he had under consideration, and were moreover based principally on second-hand knowledge gained from Weber, as a result of which he was sometimes seriously misled as to facts. It is with regret that I find it necessary to differ so radically with a scholar whose work on the *Pañcatantra* has given me so much valuable information and inspiration. Let me in this connection say that to a large extent the work which I am attempting to do on the *Vikramacarita* was suggested by the very fruitful results which Hertel produced out of his intensive and comparative study of the *Pañcatantra*. I am also in receipt of a very kind personal letter from Professor Hertel, and of some other materials which he was good enough to send me, which contain valuable suggestions as to methods of work in this field, and for which I take this opportunity to publicly thank him.



Hertel's occasion for bringing in the *Vikramacarita* is this: he desires to show that the *Pañcatantra* story of the Weaver as *Viṣṇu*<sup>1</sup> was inserted in the two recensions of that work wherein it appears by a Jaina, as a satire on the god *Viṣṇu*. This would jump with his theory that these two recensions were of Jainistic origin. Hertel found from Weber that a metrical version of this fable was inserted in the single MS. known to him of the Metrical version of the *Vikramacarita* (II, see above, p. 263). Now unfortunately for Hertel's theory, this MS. belongs, as Weber shows, to an indubitably Brahministic recension. In all the other MSS, including all those of the Jainistic recension, this supposedly Jainistic "satire on *Viṣṇu*" is not found: it remained for the compiler of a Brahministic version to insert it; or else, on the perhaps still more improbable assumption which Hertel seems inclined to make that this single, metrical, obviously late and secondary recension preserves an episode of the original that has disappeared from every other version—on this assumption, I say, we must suppose that the only recension to preserve this attack on *Viṣṇu* was a Brahministic version, while the anti-Brahministic *recensio jainica* expunged it. There is no third alternative, if Hertel is right in thinking that the story of the Weaver as *Viṣṇu* is Jainistic. And it would be hard to say which is the less likely.

As I have said, Hertel seems to prefer to impale himself on the second horn of this dilemma, viz. the assumption that the metrical MS. T preserves the story from the original. He thinks he finds support for this in the fact that nearly all manuscripts of all recensions have, in fact, at this spot in the story the opening verse, which is at the same time the catch-word for the whole fable. This verse says in effect that the gods come to the aid of a man who proceeds confidently and with firm resolve, as *Viṣṇu* helped the Weaver. It seems to me clear that it was brought in simply as a proverbial allusion to a well-known story, illustrating the moral which the speaker wished at the moment to enforce, viz.: "God helps those who help themselves". The verse fits perfectly the place where it is inserted, and doubtless belonged

<sup>1</sup> A famous jocular story in which an impostor of low birth (a weaver) rigs himself up as *Viṣṇu*, and works the trick so well that he marries the king's daughter: attacked by a powerful force of enemies, he impudently takes the field alone in his garb of *Viṣṇu*, and the real *Viṣṇu* comes to his defense, in order to save his own credit before the people, who believed in the weaver as the true *Viṣṇu*.

to the original *Vikramacarita*, since it occurs in most versions. Assuming the evident fact that the Weaver as Viṣṇu was a popular and well-known story, nothing could be more natural than an allusion to it in such a connection. The writer of the late poetic recension then took advantage of the allusion to the story which he already found there, and gave an exhibition of his art and his learning by writing out the whole thing in full—a process which occurs repeatedly in the history of Sanskrit story redactions, as no one has shown more clearly than Prof. Hertel. But the simple explanation does not appeal to him in this case. Instead he tries to prove the Jainistic character of the original *Vikramacarita*, from which he supposes that T has preserved the story in full. He does so partly (1) on the ground of false ideas of the contents of the Tübingen MS. V, which he had never seen, and Weber's statements about which he misunderstood: and partly (2) on the ground of what seem to me distorted notions of the attitude one should expect to find displayed towards the orthodox Hindu gods, and of the distinctions that it is safe to make between Jains and orthodox Hindus. (Cf. Barth, l. c.)

1) In the nineteenth story Vikrama pays a visit to Bali, a sort of Hindu Hades, reigning in Pātāla (the under-world). The two kings exchange graceful compliments, and Vikrama is entertained by Bali. Among other courteous speeches, Vikrama says to Bali that it is an especial honor to see one to whom Nārāyaṇa (the god Viṣṇu) once came "with a request" (*arthitvena*). This is the only reference to Viṣṇu in this story in the Southern version, and surely there is no insult to the god contained in it. It is a very delicate allusion on the part of Vikrama to a well-known episode in which Bali, who was at one time a demon and an enemy of the gods, was outwitted by Viṣṇu. Bali was once king over the universe: but Viṣṇu appeared before him in the guise of a dwarf and asked of him as much land as he could cover in three strides. The wish being granted, the god assumed his true form and deprived Bali of heaven and earth in two strides, vouchsafing to leave him the under-world. Since Bali is his host, Vikrama on this occasion politely ignores everything except the fact that Bali once received the honor of a visit from the great god Viṣṇu, who asked a favor of him. The myth of Bali and Viṣṇu, by the way, is one whose orthodox character is unquestioned and unquestionable.

In the short recension (III) no allusion to Viṣṇu of any sort is

found. But in the Jainistic version (IV) we find a new addition. Here Viṣṇu is found acting as doorkeeper (*dvārapālaka*) in the palace of Bali! So far as I have been able to discover there is no authority for such a statement anywhere else, among all the numerous allusions to Viṣṇu and Bali in Hindu literature. Apparently it was invented by the author of the Jainistic version—perhaps, as Hertel thinks, as an insult to Viṣṇu, though even here, be it noted, he is called “*ṣṛī Kṛṣṇa*” and spoken of not without respect. At any rate there is every reason to suppose that the Southern version, whose allusion to the myth is consistent with the other accounts of it known to us, was original, and that the Jainistic touch which makes Viṣṇu Bali's door-keeper is a somewhat bizarre Jainistic addition.<sup>1</sup>

2) In a more general way I am compelled to take issue with Prof. Hertel's methods—with the means by which he undertakes to distinguish between that which is Jainistic and that which is Brahministic. It seems to me that he draws much too sharp and clear-cut distinctions between the two spheres. So in the matter of terminology: there are certain terms, epithets and phrases which are used very commonly by the Jainas. But that does not mean that wherever they occur, in any text, they must refer to things Jainistic. Hertel says (p. 86) that the word *digambara* and certain other words “*können*” nur auf Jaina bezogen werden”. Perhaps he means to say only when they are used all together: but on p. 89 n. 1 he follows Weber in making the word *digambara* (here without the support of any other similar words!) a proof

<sup>1</sup> Hertel bases his whole argument at this point on the mistaken assumption that the Tübingen MS, Weber's V, a MS of the Southern recension, agrees with the Jainistic version in this. He is misled by a rather careless statement of Weber's (p. 380 n. 1, seventh line), where for “in allen Textformen” read “in allen von der Rec. Jain. abhängigen Textformen”. “Alle” in Weber's notes to his extracts from the Jainistic version always has this meaning, and never includes, unless specifically so stated, his manuscripts of other recensions, namely O, C, V and T. (The Vararuci MSS R and U, as well as K and S, are for the most part really Jainistic MSS.) The only allusion to Viṣṇu at this point in Weber's V is that translated above, in which it agrees with all the MSS. of the Southern Rec. known to me. The text of the sentence (disregarding a few orthographic variants) is: *tavāiva janma ślāghyaṁ, sākṣād Vāikuṇṭhakaṇṭhīravo Nārāyaṇas tava mandīraṁ samāyāto 'rthitvena*. So, essentially, all my MSS: Jivānanda's edition reads, I know not on what authority, *sadā virājati* for *samāyāto 'rthitvena*. As has been said, the MSS of the short recension (incl. Weber's C) have no reference to Viṣṇu at all.

<sup>2</sup> Italics mine.

that the person designated was a Jaina monk of the *digambara* sect, and (since the person is depicted as a faithless traitor) concludes that the passage where it occurs is an attack upon that sect, though there is otherwise not a shred of evidence to support this view.—Now the word *digambara* is first an adjective meaning “naked”, and second a noun, meaning “a naked ascetic”. The standard dictionaries allow its use of any naked ascetic in India (and would Hertel maintain that all naked Indian ascetics are Jainas?), and according to Monier-Williams (*Brahminism and Hinduism*, p. 83) the word is used as an epithet of the god *Çiva*, in his aspect as naked ascetic. In other words, the word simply means *any* naked ascetic, and when there is otherwise no evidence that a text is speaking of Jainists, there is no reason for assuming that this word necessarily refers to a Jaina. The same is true, I believe, of most of the other words regarded by Hertel as necessarily Jainistic.

Equally unsound seems to me the tendency of Hertel to declare of heterodox origin every incident which treats the Hindu gods with less than what he considers a due amount of respect. For instance, as to the story of the Weaver as *Viṣṇu* above mentioned, Hertel uses the same sweeping language as in the passage just referred to: (p. 115 f.) “Es ist mir undenkbar, das der Anhänger irgend einer brahmanischen Sekte, sei es selbst ein *Çaiva* oder ein *Çakta*, diese Satire geschrieben haben . . . . sollte”. The “satire” consists in the fact that *Viṣṇu*, when informed of the weaver’s prank, is moved to come to the rogue’s rescue, lest he be killed, and the people therefore (thinking “*Viṣṇu* is dead”!) should offer no more sacrifices! But was this, to a Hindu mind of that day, such a serious insult to *Viṣṇu*? Is it not rather an example of the way popular deities are usually treated by their worshippers, especially among semi-primitive peoples? It seems to me a basic mistake to philosophize the matter as Hertel does. The writer of the story did not stop to ask himself whether or not the action of *Viṣṇu* was consistent with the god’s character and dignity. The purpose of the story, the whole point of the narrative (“God helps those who help themselves”), required that *Viṣṇu* should save the bold, though tricky, weaver. That is all there is to it. Even in our own day are not jocose stories told in which Christian saints appear in humorously undignified positions? And are not the tellers of these stories generally perfectly pious Christians? I am sure it would not be hard to find, at least in some of the more outlying

Christian countries of Europe, anecdotes in which the persons of the Trinity would be treated equally freely—and with no real disrespect intended. Even in serious texts it would not be hard to find in India stories where the gods are treated, by writers of unquestionable orthodoxy, in ways that would seem to us blasphemous. From the earliest Vedic times onward this is characteristic of many Indra legends (e. g. his affair with Namuci). In the Mahābhārata too the persons of the Hindu trinity come off with scant dignity on numerous occasions (though to be sure it is fashionable to explain the most glaring cases as due to "sectarian differences").

In short, the fact that a Hindu god appears in what seems to us an unfavorable light in a given text does not furnish much, if any, reason for affirming that the text was written by a disbeliever in that god.

Moreover all this does not really concern the Vikramacarita. For there is no reason to suppose that the original Vikramacarita contained any situation which even by Hertel's criteria could be regarded as insulting to the orthodox Hindu gods. Of the two cases he cites one is limited to the Jainistic versions, and the other to the late and clearly secondary metrical version.

As a concrete illustration of the way the versions differ we append translations of a typical story, the twelfth, in the three principal recensions. The variations in plot are obvious and interesting, but this is not the time to discuss them. The verses of the original are printed with an indentation and numbered in the translation. Only two of the verses of the Southern, Nos. 2 and 3, appear also in the Jainistic,<sup>1</sup> as Nos. 5 and 6. The Short Recension has no verses in this story. The first two Jainistic verses comprise the "argumentum" or summary of the story (see above), and are therefore essentially unlike the other verses.

Words enclosed in parentheses, but printed in ordinary type, are necessary parts of the English translation, which are however not expressed in the Sanskrit, but understood from the context. *Italicized* words without parentheses are simply foreign (non-English) words;<sup>2</sup> but *in* parentheses they indicate either 1) alternative translations, intended to make the meaning clearer, or 2) explanatory notes added for the same purpose.

<sup>1</sup> With a few verbal variants of little importance.

<sup>2</sup> Barring a few cases where English words are italicized for emphasis, generally translating a Sanskrit particle of emphasis, *eva* or *api*.



## TWELFTH STORY.

A. *Southern Recension.*

When the king again approached the throne to mount upon it, another statue said: O king, this is Vikrama's throne. Whoever is possessed of the nobility and other virtues of Vikrama, let him mount upon this throne.

And Bhoja said: Tell me a tale of his nobility and other virtues.

And the statue said: Hearken, O King!

In the reign of Vikramārka there was in his city a merchant named Bhadrasena, who had a son Purandara. And there was no end to the wealth of this Bhadrasena: yet was he not a squanderer. Now in the course of time Bhadrasena died, and his son Purandara inherited all his father's property, and began to waste it extravagantly.

B. *Short Recension.*<sup>1</sup>

Hearken, O king!

In the city of Vikramārka there was a certain merchant who had unlimited wealth. And he in time came to the end of his life. Then his son threw away his wealth in evil courses.

C. *Jainistic Recension.*

Again on another occasion when King Bhoja had performed all the coronation rites and was mounting the throne, the twelfth statue said: O king, (only) he mounts (*may mount*) upon this throne who has nobility like (that of) Vikramāditya.

And when the king asked: Of what sort was that nobility? the statue said: O king, hearken!

(*"Argumentum", here in two verses:*)

(1) Having obtained great wealth by trade, and being rich as the Lord of Wealth (*the god Kubera*), a certain merchant died. His evil-minded son paid no heed to the timely warnings of his father's people and his other friends, who said: 'Look now, do not destroy this fortune by wicked wastefulness'. Bearing the stamp of his poverty (thus) brought about, he wandered forth into another country and came to a certain grove, rich in fair fruits.

(2) There he heard a woman crying by night.—Having heard all this from his lips, the noble Vikramārka went forth by night, taking his sword with sharp-gleaming-blade, and slew in conflict a demon that was tormenting the woman. The woman, freed from torment caused by her husband, gave him nine jars of gold, but he gave them to the merchant's son.

In the city of Avantī, the noble king Vikrama.

(There was) a merchant Bhadrasena, whose son (was) Purandara. After his father's death he became (truly) a '*purandara*' ('*lavish dispenser*') of his father's wealth, enjoying himself in riotous living.

<sup>1</sup> *Eleventh* in this version, owing to a shift in the numbering. The Leipzig manuscript, owing to the accidental omission of an earlier tale, makes it the *tenth*.

*(Southern Recension.)*

Once upon a time his close friend Dhanada said to him: Purandara, although thou art of a mercantile family, thou dost waste thy money like a scion of nobility. This is not a mark of one sprung from a merchant's house. A merchant's son even though quite alone (*without a family*), should amass wealth, and should not waste so much as a cowry (*a very small coin*). The goods a man acquires will some day be of service to him, when some calamity occurs. So a prudent man should save up wealth against the coming of calamity. And it is said:

(1) A man shall defend his possessions for the event of misfortune, but shall defend his wife (if necessary) even with his possessions: himself however he shall always defend, even with (*at the sacrifice of*) both his wife and his possessions.

Hearing these words Purandara said: Dhanada, he who says that 'goods acquired will sometime be beneficial, when calamity occurs' is lacking in good judgment. When calamities come, then the riches that have been laid up are lost also. Therefore the wise man is not grieved for the past nor distressed about the future, but he should rather attend only to the present. And thus it is said:

*(Short Recension.)*

And he obeyed not the voice of his friends who warned him.

*(Jainistic Recension.)*

And his relations would have restrained him, saying: Look now, do not waste wickedly: wealth, if preserved, will be (surely) of some use or other. Wealth is the source of man's greatness,—since:

(3) This mass of waters (*the ocean, from which sprang Lakṣmī, goddess of Wealth and wife of Viṣṇu*) in producing your ladyship, O Lakṣmī! became a mine of jewels: the slayer of (the demon) Mura (*i. e. Viṣṇu*) by becoming thy husband became the lord of the three worlds: Kandarpa (*god of love*) through being thy son (*nandana*) became also the rejoicer (*nandana: a pun*) of the hearts of men: everywhere, I ween, high position has (*is due to*) the favor of thy grace.

By (the power of) wealth even faults become virtues: for:

(4) Sluggishness is changed into conservatism; restlessness takes the appearance of vigorous activity; taciturnity appears as reserve; stupidity becomes simple honesty; inability to distinguish (in giving alms) between the good and the worthless is changed into high-spirited generosity. O mother Lakṣmī! By the power of thy favor even vices shall become virtues!

When he heard these words of his relations he said:

*(Southern Recension.)*

(2) One should not grieve for the past, nor be distressed about the future: the wise occupy themselves with the things of the present.

What is to be, that will be, without any (outside) exertion: and what is (destined) to pass away, even thus will it pass away. And it is said:

(3) That which is destined to be—*is*, (maturing) like the milk of a cocoanut. That which is destined to pass away—it is already gone, they say, as a *kapittha*-fruit eaten by an elephant.

(4) For what is not to be surely is not, and what is to be, is, without any effort: and that which is not destined to belong to a man is lost to him, though he hold it in the palm of his hand.

To these words of Purandara Dhanada, having no reply, remained silent.

Then Purandara proceeded to waste all his father's goods. And then, when Purandara had no more money, his friends and relatives esteemed him no more, and would not even associate with him. And Purandara reflected in his heart: As long as there was money in my hands, so long these friends of mine were attentive unto me. But now they have no dealings with me. This is a true (observation on human) behavior: he who has money, he also has friends and the like. And it is said:

(5) He who has money has friends: he who has money has relatives: he who has money is a (great) man in the world: he who has money is also a scholar!

---

*(Short Recension.)*

Thus when his wealth had been dissipated, being poor—

---

*(Jainistic Recension.)*

(5) One should not grieve for the past, nor be distressed about the future: the wise occupy themselves with the present time.

(6) That which is destined to be—*is*, (maturing) like the milk of a cocoanut. That which is destined to pass away—it is already gone, they say, as a *kapittha*-fruit eaten by an elephant.

Then he spent and consumed all the wealth that his father had acquired. And when in the course of time he became poor, he was despised by his relations. For:

(7) Better is a forest infested by tigers and elephants, a shelter of trees, a diet of leaves, fruits and water, a bed of grass—better worn-out bark (garments), than life among relations for a man who has lost his wealth.

*(Southern Recension.)*

Furthermore:

(6) When a man is bereft of his money his relations do not crowd around him as before: being attached to his station alone, his parasites quickly go their own ways, his friends scatter, and—why make of it a long story? Even a man's wife is certain to have not so much regard for him when he has lost his wealth.

(7) Whatsoever man has wealth, that man is noble, learned, pious and virtuous: he verily is eloquent also, and handsome: all virtues rest upon gold.

Moreover:

(8) A thousand relations will attend a rich man, as long as he stands upon his feet, unscathed: but when he has lost his wealth no relative will so much as show his face.

And so:

(9) The wind is a friend of the fire that devours the forest, but he destroys the fire of a lamp: who has friendship for a poor man?

Therefore death is better than poverty. And it is said:

(10) 'Arise, my friend, and carry for just a moment the burden of my poverty, that poor weary I may at last enjoy the happiness that death has brought thee!' Hearing this cry of a poverty-stricken wretch, the corpse in the graveyard held its peace, knowing that death is much better than poverty.

And so:

(11) Hail to thee, Poverty! By thy grace I am become a magician! For though I can see everybody, no man can see me at all!

And likewise:

(12) Dead is a poor man: dead is conjugal intercourse that leads not to children: dead is a funeral-rite performed without a scripture-learned priest: dead is a sacrifice without a sacrificial fee.

Thus reflecting he went away into a far country.

*(Short Recension.)*

He went into a far country.

*(Jainistic Recension.)*

Thus reflecting he went into a far country.

*(Southern Recension.)*

And as he wandered he came to a certain city located near the Himālaya. And not far from this city there was a grove of bamboo. And he himself came to the outskirts of the town, and slept at night in the porch of some one's house. And at midnight he heard the shrieks of some woman crying in the bamboo grove: 'Good people, save me, save me, some *Rākṣasa* (demon) here is killing me'!

Having heard these cries, early in the morning he asked the people of the town: Good people, what is this in the bamboo grove here? Who is the woman that cries (there)?

And they said: Every night the sound of these cries is heard there in the grove. But every one is afraid to go and find what it is.

Then Purandara returned to his own city, and went to see the king.

And the king asked him: Purandara, what noteworthy thing hast thou seen while traveling in foreign parts?

Then Purandara told the king the story of the bamboo grove. And hearing of this strange occurrence the king set out with him for that city. And hearing at night the sound of the woman's wailing in the bamboo grove he went into the grove, and saw a *rākṣasa* in the act of murdering a helpless woman, who was screaming in extreme terror.

*(Short Recension.)*

Then going along the road he came to a certain town. There was a certain grove. In it a lone woman cried by night: Let some one save me!

Hearing this he asked the people of the place. Then the people replied: There a certain *rākṣasa* is devouring a woman. Her cries are constantly heard. But no one knows what it is (! *Reading uncertain and corrupt*).

Having seen this the merchant's son went back again to his own city, and told the king the occurrence.

Then the king took his shield and his sword and went forth with him. And he came to that city. Then at night, hearing the woman's cries in that grove, he took his sword (? *corrupt*) and went forth. There a *rākṣasa* was causing the woman to cry out (!).

*(Jainistic Recension.)*

And as he wandered he came to a city near Mount Malaya (! *a confusion between this mountain, in Malabar, and the Himālaya (Himācala) of the Southern version has occurred. Which was the original?*). And there he heard at night the call of some woman crying in distress with a piteous cry. And in the morning he asked the people.

And they said: We know not: every night some woman cries there: and therefore our city is greatly afraid, fearing some disaster. Having heard these things Purandara told the king. And the king out of curiosity went to that city.



*(Southern Recension.)*

And he said: Thou wretch, why dost thou kill a helpless woman?

And the *rākṣasa* said: What is that to thee? Go thine own way, or thou shalt die a useless death at my hands.

Then they fought, and the *rākṣasa* was killed by the king.

Then the woman came and fell at the king's feet and said: My lord, by thy grace I am released from a curse: thou hast brought me out of a great ocean of misery.

And the king said: Who art thou?

And she replied: Listen! In this very city there was an extremely rich Brahmin. His wife was I: but I was wanton and cared nothing for him, although he had a great affection for me. And I, having overweening pride in my beauty and charms, would not come when he bade me lie with him. Therefore, having been tormented with love all his life, at the time of his death my husband cursed me, saying:

*(Short Recension.)*

Then they two fought, and the *rākṣasa* was killed by the king.

Then the woman said to the king: O king, by thy grace I have escaped from (the consequences of) my (evil) deeds.

The king said: Who art thou?

She said: I was the wife of a certain Brahmin in this city. In the lustfulness of youth I deceived my husband. Then at the time of his death my husband cursed me (saying):

*(Jainistic Recension.)*

And at night he put on his sword and took his stand in the grove (? '*velā-vane*', prob. corrupt: read '*veṇuvane*', as Southern?). And when he heard the woman's cries he went in that direction, and saw a *rākṣasa* of fearful aspect beating a woman with blows of a whip.

And being filled with compassion the king said: Ho there, accursed *rākṣasa*! Why dost thou murder a woman? If there is any strength in thy arm, then fight with me!

Then in the fight between the two the *rākṣasa* was slain by the king.

And when she saw him (*sic*! '*tañ*', where '*tad*' would be more natural) the woman gave thanks to the king, (saying): Hail, hero of heroes! by thy grace I am become happy.

Then the king said: Lady, who art thou?

And she said: I was the wife of a Brahmin. And my husband was deeply devoted to me, but in spite of all he could do I liked him not.

*(Southern Recension.)*

Thou wicked and perverse woman! Since all my life I have been tormented because of thee, accordingly as long as thou livest a hideous *rākṣasa* that lives in the bamboo grove shall come and enjoy thee, much against thy will, every night, and shall slay thee. Thus he cursed me. But I prayed for a release from the curse, (saying): Nay, my lord, grant a release from the curse! And he said: When some man endowed with great valor and devoted to the service of others shall come hither and kill the *rākṣasa*, then shalt thou be freed from thy curse. Thus have I been freed from the curse through thee. I, now, am at the point of death: but I have nine jars of gold, which will be wasted. Do thou take them!

So speaking she told the king the place where the gold was: and her life left her. But the king gave the nine jars full of riches to the merchant Purandara, and returned with him to Ujjayinī.

Having told this story the statue said to the king: O king, if such nobility and valor are found in thee, then mount upon this throne!

And hearing this the king was silent.

*(Short Recension.)*

A *rākṣasa* of like appearance (with me? cf. the Jain. text: but our text is here corrupt) shall slay thee by night. Afterwards he granted a favor (saying): When some man shall kill the *rākṣasa*, then (shall be) thy release. Now then do thou take (these) nine jars of treasure.

The king said: One must not accept a gift from a woman.

She said: Thou hast saved my life: therefore do thou enjoy them.

Then the king gave the treasure to the merchant and returned to (his own) city.

O king, whosoever has such nobility, let him mount (this throne).

*(Jainistic Recension.)*

And from grief over this he died, and becoming a *rākṣasa* he came to me every night, out of ancient hate, and would beat me. Therefore am I today become happy through thy kindness; my persecution is at an end. And what favor can I, a weak woman, do in return for thee, great hero that thou art? Nevertheless, there is no one left in our family line: and I have nine jars of gold. Do thou take them. That which I give thee is a mere trifle altogether.

Then the king, just for amusement's sake (! 'līlayāiva': corrupt?), gave this treasure to Purandara, and returned to his own city.

Therefore, O King, if such nobility is found in thee, then do thou mount upon this throne!

FRANKLIN EDGERTON.

JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, May, 1912.

## II.—THE DATIVE WITH PREPOSITIONAL COMPOUNDS.

The question of the advisability of retaining in the Latin Grammar the rule for a dative with verbs compounded with prepositions is one that must now be faced by every student of Latin syntax. This question was recently answered with a very vigorous negative by Professor E. W. Fay, who, in the *Class. Quart.*, Vol. V, July, 1911, p. 104, characterizes it as "a lazy-bed for grammarians, for pupils a very opiate and narcotic to reflection". That it is both an opiate and a narcotic to reflection few teachers who have watched its workings in the class-room, would venture to deny, tho some might consider it advisable to add the terms *Circe*, *Siren*, *Delilah*, a delusion and a snare, with the addition that it was "a mocker, and whoso is deceived thereby is not wise", as more descriptive of its treacherous allurements. Be that as it may, it is the writer's firm conviction that the rule has caused more trouble than it is worth. In fact, as early as 1878 a note of warning was sounded by *Draeger*, H. S., I., p. 377 and repeated on p. 419, who said in effect that there was only one trouble with this rule and that was that it wouldn't work. It had long been the intention of the writer to try and determine the exact value of this rule, when the above remarks of Professor Fay precipitated it. To attempt to solve all of the problems presented by prepositional compounds is not the province of this paper. The chief object in view is merely to show how often the rule works, how often it does not work, and to render it thereby possible to substitute for a more or less vague impression a more precise and exact statement of its actual value. Then, if the rule is still retained, much of its disastrous results will be prevented. The field that the writer has taken for investigation will, it is hoped, be considered sufficiently representative in its character and sufficiently broad in its extent to answer the question for the student in the High School and College.<sup>1</sup> It is believed that an examination of a more ex-

<sup>1</sup> In the High School, the usual amount covered, *Caesar* I-IV, *Cicero*, *Cat.*, *Arch.*, *Pomp.*, *Vergil* I-VI; in College, a course of reading ample in amount

tended field would not materially affect the results reached by this investigation and that the value of the rule in general is practically the same as that expressed here. To settle questions of valuation, it is evident that the most decisive course of procedure is to count both the number of times the rule *works*, to use the vigorous Anglo-Saxon, and, especially in this case, to count the number of times it *does not work*. The latter is a phase of the question that has hitherto not received the attention it deserves. For the sake of clearness in presentation and in order that one may see at a glance the exact usage of each of the prepositional compounds, the results have been tabulated.<sup>1</sup>

## I. BY WRITERS.

Writers.	Acc.	Dat.	Acc. c. Dat.	Pass. c. Dat.	Without Dat.	With Dat.	% Dat.
Cato.....	298	6	5	2	488	13	2.6
Plautus.....	110	19	8	1	149	28	15.8
Terence.....	107	12	12	5	145	29	16.7
Sallust.....	456	73	32	8	863	113	11.6
Caesar.....	319	51	50	8	838	109	11.4
Cicero H. S.....	213	45	41	35	641	121	15.8
Vergil.....	379	74	93	13	717	180	20
Horace.....	98	16	30	5	156	51	24.6
Nepos.....	483	93	54	11	874	158	15.3
Cicero, C. M., Lael.....	157	35	13	8	358	56	13.5
Livy I.....	209	34	38	22	469	94	16.7
Livy XXI, XXII.....	390	53	57	34	846	144	14.5
Juvenal.....	87	21	18	3	117	42	26.4
Tacitus.....	173	28	19	9	362	56	13.4
Suetonius.....	384	41	41	25	759	107	12.4
Total.....	3863	601	511	189	7782	1301	14.3

## NOTES.

- a) In Caesar the value of the rule is 11.4%, in Cicero 15.1%.
- b) The value of the rule in High School Latin<sup>2</sup> is 15.7%.
- c) The value of the rule as judged by the usage of all the above writers is 14.3%.

to satisfy most demands, Cato Agr., Plautus Capt., Terence Phormio, Sall. Cat., Jug., Nepos, Cicero Cato M., Lael., Livy I, XXI, XXII, Horace Carm. I-IV, Tac. Ann. I, Iuv. I, VI, X, and Suet., Caes., Aug.

<sup>1</sup> Throughout this investigation such compounds as *proficiscor*, *progredior*, etc., which never take an accus. or dative, as well as those with a clause as an object, or with the object unexpressed, were all excluded.

<sup>2</sup> For particulars see the writer's treatment of this subject in the *Classical Journal* (1912), Oct. and B. M. Allen, in the *Classical Weekly*, V (1912), p. 170 f.

d) The value in poetry as contrasted with that in prose is shown by the table:

	Without Dat.	With Dative.	% Dative.
Prose .....	6500	971	12.9
Poetry .....	1284	330	20.4

In early Latin poetry the value of the rule, as shown by the fragments, for Livius Andr. is 19% (17-4), for Naevius, 10% (36-4), and for Ennius (V.) 10.5% (111-13). With this contrast that for Plautus, 15.8% and Cato 2.6%.

e) A glance at individual usage shows that in Caesar and Cicero combined a dative is used 286 times, but is not used 1837 times. Its value, therefore, for standard prose is 13.5%. In point of fact, in no prose writer is its value more than 16.7% and this is in the poetical prose of Livy I. In poetry, however, the rule is in more honor, having a value of 26.4% in Juvenal, of 24.6% in Horace, and of 20% in Vergil. In strong contrast to this stands the usage of Cato, where the rule has a value of only 2.6%.

f) If, in order to determine the value of the rule, we take into consideration only the case that is used with the *active*, we find that the acc. is used 3863 times, the dat. 601 times, and, hence, from this point of view the rule is worth only 13.4%. In Caesar and Cicero, the acc. is used 689 times, the dat. 131, and the value is 15.9%. In prose the value is 12.3%, in poetry 15.3%, being greatest in Juvenal, 19.4%.

## II. BY PREPOSITIONS.

Preps.	Acc.	Dat.	Acc. c. Dat.	Pass. c. Dat.	Without Dat.	With Dat.	% Dat.
Ad .....	947	95	111	38	1667	244	12.8
Ante .....	27	5	14	9	31	28	48.2
Circum .....	85	0	5	4	178	9	4.9
Con .....	1062	78	68	25	2408	171	6.6
In .....	671	136	146	50	1414	332	19
Inter .....	89	24	2	3	281	29	9.2
Ob .....	408	98	55	17	745	170	18.6
Prae .....	138	75	67	19	240	161	40
Pro .....	189	25	15	6	375	46	10.9
Sub .....	242	56	27	18	434	101	18.9
Super .....	5	9	1	0	9	10	52.6
Total .....	3863	601	511	189	7782	1301	14.3



## NOTES.

a) Prepositions vary from the point of view of the frequency with which they enter into composition. Those found most often are *con* 2579, *ad* 1911, *in* 1746, those found least often *super* 19, *ante* 59, *circum* 187.

b) Prepositional compounds vary also from the point of view of their value in the rule. *Super* heads the list with 52.6%, followed by *ante* with 48.2% and *prae* 40%, and at the other extreme are found *circum* with 4.9%, *con*, 6.6%, *inter*, 9.2%, and *pro* 10.9%.

c) From the point of view of the acc. and dat., *super* stands at one extreme with a value of 63.6% and *circum* at the other with 0%, *prae* standing midway with 35.2%.

d) With four prepositions the acc. c. dat. is used more frequently than the simple dat., *ad*, *ante*, *circum*, *in*. In contrast to these stand *inter* and *super*, with whom the acc. c. dat. is very rare.

e) *Super* is the only one of the prepositions not found in the passive with a dative.

## DETAILED USAGE.

a) AD: with dat. 244 times, without, 1667, value 12.8%; greatest value in Horace 62.5% (12-20)<sup>1</sup> and in Juvenal 25% (18-6). It may be noted that in Vergil (187-39) and in Livy I (124-27) the value is practically the same, 17 + %, but in Livy XXI, XXII (191-21) only 9 + %. The value is least in Cato 1.4% (69-1) and in Plautus 5.3% (36-2) (Cato 14.5 *accedo*; Pl. 708 *addo* and 1028 *adimo*, acc. c. dat.). In Caesar (125-22) and Cicero (227-29) the value is 12.6%. With the active alone, comparing the acc. and dat., the value of the rule is 9.1%, in Cic. and Caes. above, 14.6%.

b) ANTE: with dat. 28, without, 31, value 48.2%. In two writers Livy, Juvenal, *ante-* was not used at all; in four only once each; in four only with dat., Cato (156.1 *antisto*), Nepos (3. 1. 2 *-sto*), Plautus (840 *-verto*, acc. c. dat.) Vergil (4,371, *-fero*, acc. c. dat.); in one only with acc., Hor. (1. 35. 17, *-eo*). In the entire period there were only 11 verbs used, *ante(i)sto*, *-capio* (6), *cedo* (10), *cello* (2), *eo* (6), *fero* (11) *figo*, *habeo*, *pono* (14), *venio* (6), *verto*, in all 59 occur-

<sup>1</sup> The first number in parenthesis shows the times the dat. is not used, the second, the times it is used.

rences. With the accusative are found *capio* 6 (Sall.), *cedo* 8 (Caes. 2, Nep. 5, Suet.), *eo* 5 (Ter., Sall., Nep. 2, Hor.), *fero* 1 (Tac. 47), *pono* 1 (Tac. 58), *venio* 6 (Sall. 5, Tac.), in all 27 times (pass. abs., *fero* Nep. 2, Tac. 1, *pono* 1, Tac.). In Terence the acc. is used once (247 *eo*), the dat. once (*cedo* 525). In Cicero the dative only is used (4. 3, Pomp. 14 *cello*, and *pono* pass. 3, acc. c. dat. 3). Nepos with 17 (9-8) and Sallust with 15 (12-3) use compounds of *ante* most frequently. Next to these is Cicero with 8 (all with dat.) and Tacitus with 7 (5-2, the dat. being *habeo* 58, acc. c. dat. and *figo* 61, pass. c. dat.). Of the total 28 times the dative is used, half are in the acc. c. dat. and of this, 12 are of two verbs, *fero* 7, *pono* 5.<sup>1</sup> In the active the acc. is found 27 times, the dat. 5 times, and the value of *ante* is 15.6%.

c) CIRCUM: with dat. 9, without 178, value 4.9%. Its value in seven writers is 0, Cato (18),<sup>2</sup> Plaut. (1), Sall. (29), Cic. (9), Nepos (11), Tac. (15), Suet. (11). Terence and Horace do not use any compounds of *circum*, and in Caesar and Cicero they were used 28 times without a dat. and once with (Caes. 2. 6. 2 -*icio*, pass.). Vergil (8) and Juvenal (4) have the dat. once each, and with one verb, -*do* 2. 510, Juv. 6. 458). Livy I (12) does not have a dat., but XXI, XXII (43) have 6 (acc. c. dat. *do* 3, *fundo*, 1 and pass. 2). The dative alone is never used with *circum*.

d) CON: with dat. 171, without 2408, value 6.6%. In Cato (179) its value is 0, and in no writer does it reach higher than in Ter. 17.1% (32-7), followed by Juv. with 13.2% (39-6). In Caesar its value is 5.2% (329-18), in Cic. H. S. 5.4% (280-16) and Cic. Coll. 9.8% (111-12), Sall. 8% (273-26), Nepos 6.1% (306-20), Livy I, 11.8% (105-14) but XXI, XXII, 6.3% (183-13), in Tac. 8.3% (66.6), and Suet. 5.8% (245-15). In the active (acc. and dat.) its value is 6.8%. Of the total of 78 times that the dat. is used, four verbs constitute 55 (*fido* 14, *sulo*, 20, -*tingo* 12, *venio* 9).

e) IN: with dat. 332, without 1414, value 19%. Its highest value is in Juvenal, 34.5% (19-11) and Vergil 33% (144-71), its lowest value in Cato .08% (127-1: *imperari*, 142) and Terence

<sup>1</sup> With the compounds of *ante* given in the Thesaurus the dat. is used 331 times (70 being of -*fero*, 168 of *pono*, with acc. c. dat.), but not used 392 times, and the value for this prefix is 45.8% in Latin literature. So also of *circum*: without dat. 3692+times, with dat. 338 (147 verbs used only with the acc.), with a value for *circum* of 8.4%. The Thesaurus shows 19 verbs compounded with *ante* and 163 with *circum*.

<sup>2</sup> The number of times a dative is not used is placed in parenthesis.

2.5% (39-1: *inici* 692). In Caesar its value is 15.6% (141-26), Cic. 22.2% (121-36). In prose its value is 16.8% (1131-228), but in poetry, 27.8% (284-108). In the active, in contrast to the acc., its value is 19.2% (671-136). The most common verbs with a dat. are *immineo* 10, *indulgeo* 17, *invideo* 10, *impendeo* 8.

f) INTER: with dat. 29, without 281, value 9.2%. In seven writers the value is 0, Cato (3), Plaut. (1), Ter. (1), Sall. (29), Cic. H. S. (32), Verg. (5), Juv. (1). In the others, Caesar 6% (47-3), Hor. 25% (3-1), Nepos 5.7 (66-4), Cic. Coll. 11.2 (16-2), Livy I, 26.1 (17-6), XXI, XXII, 26.3 (14-5). Tac. 5.6 (17-1), Suet. 17.1 (29-6). In the active the acc. is used 89 times, the dat. 24, or 21.2%, but of the 24 *intersum* is 14, *-venio* 4 (Livy I. 36. 1; 48. 1; 9; Suet. A. 20), *-dico* 3 (Caes. I. 46. 4, Nep. 22. 2, 3, Suet. A. 66. 2).

g) OB: with dat. 170, without 745, value 18.6%. The highest value is in Plaut. 40% (12-8, *obsto* 3, *obsum* 2), Juv. 33.3% (10-5), Verg. 29.5% (55-23), Ter. 29.4% (12-5), the lowest in Cato 9.4% (29-3), Suet. 10.3 (78-9). In the active, acc. = 408, dat. 94, value, 18.7%. In Caesar and Cicero the value is 20.6% (143-37). The most common verbs used are *occurro* 21, *-sto* 14, *-sisto* 11, *-tingo* 7.

h) PRAE: with dat. 161, without 240, value 40%. The greatest value is in Nepos 66.7% (26-48), due to the fact that out of 33 times the dat. is used in the active *praesum* constitutes 27 times. It is to be further noted that of the 74 times the dat. is used by all with an active, *praesum* constitutes 46, *praecipio* 11, *praesto* 7. In the active the acc. is used 138 times, hence the value is 34.9%. In Caes. and Cic. the value is 47.3% (48-43). In four writers the value is 50% or more, Ter. 50 (1-1) Sall. 53.1 (15-17), Caes. 52.5 (19-21), Livy I, 50 (7-7), and of the least value in Cato 11.1% (16-2).

i) PRO: with dat. 46, without 375, value 10.9%. The greatest value is in Plautus 27.3% (8-3), the least in Livy I, where it is 0 (11-0), in XXI, XXII 4% (48-2), Suet. 4.9% (58-3) Caes. 5.1% (37-2). In Cicero the value is 21.8% (43-12), in Sall. 9.8% (37-4), in Vergil 6.7% (42-3), in Hor. 11.8% (16-2). In the active the dative is used 23 times, the acc. 189, the value 10.9%. The most common verbs are *prosum* 7, *-spicio* 5.

j) SUB: with dat. 101, without 434, value 18.9%. The greatest value is in Terence 44.4% (5-4) and Juvenal 38.9% (11-7), in two writers of no value at all, Horace (15), Livy I (22). In no prose

writer is the value higher than in Sallust, 28% (18-7) and Livy XXI, XXII, 21.4% (33-9), while in Caesar it is worth only 5.1% (57-3) and in Cicero 16.9% (49-10). Here, also, there is a decided contrast between the usage of prose and of poetry: in prose with dat. 50, without 288, value 14.8%, but in poetry with dat. 41, without 107, value 27.7%. In the active the acc. is used 242 times, the dat. 56, the value 18.8%. The most common verbs with a dative are *succedo* 15, *-curro* 8, *-venio* 8.

k) SUPER: compounds with *super* were late in developing. They are found 10 times with the dat., 9 times without, with a value of 52.6%. Six writers did not use compounds of *super* at all, Cato, Plaut., Ter., Cic., Juv., Tac., and three but one each, and without a dative, Sall., Caes., Hor. In two the value of the rule is 100%, Nepos 1 (*supersum* 25. 22. 2), Suet. 2 (*-sedeo* A. 96. 1, *-pono* with acc. and dat., A. 31. 5). There were in all but 8 compounds of *super* and these were used but 19 times, as follows: *-icio* 2 (pass. abs. Hor. 2. 2. 11, Livy 21. 51. 9), *-emineo* 2 (Verg. 1. 501; 6. 856), *-impono* 1 (Verg. 4. 497), *-pono* 3 (pass. abs. Livy 21. 27. 5; with dat. 1. 34. 9, with acc. c. dat. Suet. A. 31. 5) *-scando* 1 (Livy 1. 52. 8) *-sedeo* 2 (abl. Caes. 2. 8. 1, dat. Suet. A. 96. 1), *-sum* 7 (Verg., Nep., Livy), and *-vado* 1 (acc. Sall. J. 75. 2).

#### I. DATIVE NOT USED.

##### A. Verbs with the Accusative Only.<sup>1</sup>

a) AD: *aggero*<sup>2</sup> (Cato), *amo*, *celero* (Tac.), *cendo*, *cerso*, *cesso*, *cingo* (V.), *cio*, *cipio*, *clamo* (Tac.), *colo* (Tac.) *cumulo* (V.), *cuso*, *disco*, *flecto* (Sall.), *ficio*, *firmo*, *flicto*, *fligo*, *for*, *gnosco*, *grego* (V.), *hortor*, *iaceo* (Nep.), *indo* (Cato) *ipiscor*, *iuto*, *iuvo*, *ligo*, *loquor*, *metior* (Cato, Juv.), *miror*, *moneo*, *ministro*, *oleo* (V.), *operio* (Livy I), *opto*, *orior*, *oro*, *orno*, *paro*, *pellare*, *peto*, *precor*, *prehendo* (Juv.), *porto*, *probo*, *ripio*, *rogo*, *scisco*, *sector*, *sequor*, *servo*, *sido*, *signo*, *simulo*, *specto*, *sperno*, *spicio*, *stringo*, *sulto* (Tac.), *sumo*, *tendo*, *tenuo*, *tero*, *tingo*, *trecto* (V.), *urgeo* (Hor.), *veho*, *vello* (V.) [70 verbs].

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Draeger, H. S., I, p. 377 f. and C. F. W. Mueller. Der Akkusativ, p. 132 f., the latter treating intrans. verbs.

<sup>2</sup> *Adaequo*, acc., except with *cum* Cic. Arch. 29 and acc. c. dat. Livy 1. 29. 6; 56. 1 and with dat. Suet. Aug. A. 46 and *appellere*, acc., exc. Verg. 1. 377; 3. 338; 715 acc. c. dat., are here excluded.

b) ANTE: *antecapio* (Sall. c. 13. 4; 32. 1; 42. 1; 55. 1; J. 21. 3; 50. 1) and *antevenio* (Sall. J. 4. 7; 48. 2; 56. 2; 88. 2; 96. 3, Tac. 63)<sup>1</sup> [2 verbs].

c) CIRCUM: *eo* (Cato, Sall.), *fero*, *flecto* (V.), *frio* (Cato), *fodio*, *ligo* (Cato), *lino* (Cato), *saepio* (Livy I), *seco* (Cato), *sideo*, *sisto*, *sileo* (Juv.), *scribo*, *spicio*, *sto*, *venio*, *verto* (Cato) [17 verbs].

d) CON: *addo* (Cato), *aequo* (Cato), *arguo*, *arto* (Suet.), *bibo*, *buro*, *calfacio*, *cido*, *cieo*, *cinno*, *cio*, *cipio*, *cito*, *clamo* (V.), *cludo*, *(co)emo*, *epto* (Tac.), *coquo*, *cremo*, *cupio*, *cupisco*, *decero*, *demno*, *depso* (Cato), *disco*, *do*, *dono*, *duco*, *edo*, *erceo*, *ficieo*, *firmito*, *fio*, *fodio*, *formo*, *fringo*, *fundo*, *futo*, *gemo*, *gero*, *globo*, *gnosco*, *glutino*, *hibeo*, *hortor*, *iecto*, *labor* (Suet.), *laudo*, *lego*, *libro* (Cato), *luco* (Cato), *luo*, *lustrum* (V.), *maculo*, *memero*, *mereo*, *mercior*, *meto*, *miniscor*, *minuo*, *misero*, *modo*, *moveo*, *munio*, *muniscor*, *muto*, *pellare*, *perio*, *pesco*, *plano*, *pleo*, *porto*, *prehendo*, *primo*, *probo*, *puto* (Juv.), *quasso* (Cato), *queror*, *quiro*, *rigo*, *ripio*, *roboro*, *rumpo*, *saluto*, *scendo*, *scribo*, *seco*, *secto*, *sector*, *sequor*, *servo*, *socior* (Hor.), *solor*, *spargo*, *spicio*, *spicior*, *sterno*, *struo*, *sumo*, *tamino*, *tego*, *temno*, *templor*, *tero*, *terreo*, *texo*, *tineo*, *tinuo*, *traho*, *trucido*, *tueor*, *tundo*, *turbo*, *vado* (Ter.), *vecto* (V.), *vello*, *voco*, *volvo*<sup>2</sup> [118 verbs].

e) IN: *auguro* (Livy), *buo*, *cendo*, *cerno*, *cido*, *clamo*, *coho* (Suet.), *colo*, *como* (Hor.), *conrumpto*, *crepito* (Caes.), *crepo* (Sall., Livy), *cudo* (Juv.), *curo* (V.), *cusio*, *decoro* (Hor.), *dignor* (V.), *duo* (Tac., Suet.), *fervefacio* (Cato), *findo* (V.), *finio* (Sall.), *fitior*, *flecto*, *fodio*, *gnoro*, *habeo*, *laqueo* (Hor.), *ligo*, *ludo*, *luo*, *lustrum*, *mergo*, *minuo* (Sall.), *moveo*, *no*, *noto*, *opinor*, *pedio*, *pendeo* (Ter.), *petro*, *pingo*, *ploro*, *porto*, *precior* (V.), *probo*, *pugno*, *quieto* (Suet.), *quino*, (Pl., Hor.), *quiro*, *rado*, *retio*, *rigo*, *rito*, *rogo*, *secto*, *sector*, *sequor*, *sero*, *simulo*, *sinuo*, *spicio*, *spiro* (V.), *stipo*, *stituo*, *struo*, *tamino*, *testor* (Juv.), *texo* (V.), *tingo* (Suet.), *tro*, *tueor*, *venio*, *viso*, *voco*, *volo* (Tac.), *volvo*<sup>3</sup> (Juv.) [77 verbs].

<sup>1</sup> C. F. W. Mueller, *Der Akkusativ*, p. 133, omits Tac. Ann. 1. 63, *anteverto*, Plaut. 840 with acc. and dat.

<sup>2</sup> *Colloco*: acc. c. dat. Suet. A. 64. 1, elsewhere with acc.; so *commendo*, Suet. and *concutio*, Verg. 6. 101, *consero*, pass. with dat. Verg. 5, 259, and *confiteor*, dat. Cic. Arch. 28, are also debarred from the above list.

<sup>3</sup> The following are excluded owing to their using a dative also: *incutio* Livy 22. 42. 9, *ingero* Tac. 65, *inmitto* Verg. 4. 448; 6. 1; 232; 312, *inplico* Verg. 1. 660, 2. 724; pass. c. dat.: *inicio* Nepos 7. 3. 3, *imprimo* Verg. 4. 659.



f) INTER: cipio, cludo (V., Livy I), ficio, icio, imo, luo, mitto, pellare, pono, pretor, puto (Cato), rogo, saepio (Livy) scindo, sero, telligo, viso [17 verbs].

g) OB: armo (Hor.), cido, cipio, co (Cato), culco (Cato), culo (V., Tac.), culto, cupo, duco, eo, fendo, fero, figo (Cato), gannio (Ter.), iecto, iurgo (Ter.), lecto, ligo, lino (Suet.), littero (Tac.), loquor, mitto, nubo (Livy), nuntio, (o)stento, perior, peto, pico (Cato), pono, primo, pugno, ruo, saepio (Livy), scuro, secro, servo, sideo, sideo, stringo, struo, tego, tero, testor, tineo, trunco, turbo, turo, volvo (Suet.) [48 verbs].<sup>1</sup>

h) PRAE: cedo, cido, cipio, cuo (Cato), curro (Cic. Cato M. 62; cf. Nep. 8. 1. 3), damno (Suet.), dicare, dicere, fero, fluo (Hor.), gravo (Suet.), gusto (Juv.), metuo (V.), nato (V.), occupo, opto, paro, pedio, pono, sagio (Livy), stringo, tempto, texo (V.), trunco, video (V.) [27 verbs].

Note, however, *obire* with the abl. in Vell. 2, 87. 3, Suet. Galba 3. 4, Eutrop. 7. 17; 8. 15; 10, 17 and Ambros. Epp. 53. 3 (M.).

i) PRO: bo, creo (Nep.) curo, do, duco, (e)mo, fero, ficio, fiteor, fligo, fundo, gigno (Hor.), habeo, loquor, luo (V.), mereo (Ter.), mitto, moveo, nuntio, pello, pulso, ripio, rumpo, ruo (Hor.), scindo, scribo, seco, sequor, specto (Sall.), sterno, tego, telo (Ter.), tendo (V.), tero (Hor.), traho, voco [37 verbs].

j) SUB: cendo, cido, cingo (Juv.), cipio, duco, fero, igo, lino (Plaut.), levo, mitto, moveo, orno, pecto, pleo, porto, primo, rigo (V.), ripio, ruo, scribo, sequor, sisto, spicio, spicor, spiro, stituo, stringo, tento (Plaut.), tero (Cato), tineo, traho, uro (Suet.), veho, verto [35 verbs].

k) SUPER: emineo (V.), impono (V.), scando (Livy I), vado (Sall.) [4 verbs].

#### *Summary with Accusative.*

Ad 70, ante 2, circum 17, con 118, in 77, inter 17, ob 48, prae 27, pro 37, sub 35, super 4. Total: 452 compounds, only with accusative.

#### B. FOUND IN THE PASSIVE ABSOLUTE ONLY.

AD: edo (Livy), figo, fundo, levo, scio (Nep.), scisco, tono (V.), umbro, rigo (V.), verso, voco [11 verbs].

<sup>1</sup> It is to be noted that Riemann et Goelzer, Gram. Comp. du Grec. et Lat., p. 48 say that 'of the compounds of *ob* only two *obire*, *obsidere* in all periods take the accusative'.

CIRCUM: ago (Cato), duco, figo (Cato), icio, munio (Pl.), plumbo (Cato), tondeo (Suet.) [7 verbs].

CON: celebros (V.), ceno (Cato), (co)acervo, fercio (Livy), fisco, frio, gnomino (Suet.), monstro, ploro, prendo, rado, saepio, scisco, sentio, stringo, sulto, vinco (17 verbs).

IN: cognosco, condo, compono, defetiscor (Tac.), doceo, domino, domo, doto (Ter.), exercito, experior, famo, ficio, freno, fringo (Tac.) meto, munio, muto, ordino, paro, pendo, permitto, punio, retorqueo, sepelio, spuo (Pl.), sterno, tempto, tolero, tondeo, torqueo, tracto, ulciscor (Sall.), verto, vinco, violo [35 verbs].

INTER: calo, fundo, iungo, iuvo, misceo, nosco, rumpo [7 verbs].

OB: caeco, cludo, freno, fundo, pleo, sero, signo, stino [8 verbs].

PRAE: caveo, figo (V.), fringo, ligo, nuntio, rumpo, texto, uro [8 verbs].

PRO: pono, pugno, rogo [3 verbs].

SUB: cerno (Cato), fodio, icio, pono, putro (Cato), tendo, texo (V.) [7 verbs].

SUPER: icio (Hor.), pono (Livy) [2 verbs].

Total: Pass. Absol. 105 verbs.

#### C. ONLY WITH PREPOSITIONS.

AD: curo *ad* (Ter. Caes.), curro *ad*, haeresco *in* (Cato 152), licio *ad* (Cic.), misceo, *ad* (Cic.), cum Cato, nitor *ad* (Cic.), plico *ad* (Nep., Cic.), sideo *in* (Tac.), venio *ad*, vento *sub* (V. 5, 328), verto *ad* (Sall.) [11 verbs].

CON: certo *cum* (V.), cido *in* (V.), colo *cum* (Nep.), cordo *cum* (Ter.), cresco *ad* (Suet.), curso *circum* (Cic.), flecto *cum* (Ter.), fligo *adversus* Nep., Cic., *cum*, *inter*, fluo *ad* (Nep.), fugio *ad* (Nep., V.), gregor *cum*, haereo *cum* (Cic.), iuro *contra*, *inter*, loquor *cum*, *inter*, meo *ad* (Suet.), *cum* (Cic.), *in* (Tac.), moror *apud* (Cic.), pono *cum* (Ter.), ruo *in*, sentio *ad*, *cum*, sideo *in*, sisto *in* (Cic.), *propius* Livy 1. 27. 5, spiro *cum*, surgo *ad* (Suet.), torqueo *ad*, *in* [24 verbs].

IN: aro *in* (Cato), curso *in* (Livy), fluo *in*, formo *ad*, migro *in* (Livy), repo *in* (Cic.), ripio *in* (Cato), rumpo *in* (Caes., Livy), silio *in* (Caes.), siluo *inter* (Caes.), sipio *in* (Cato), stillo *in* (Cato), veterasco *in* (Cic.), vivo *in* (Suet.) [14 verbs].

INTER: interluceo *inter* (Livy 1. 42. 4) [1 verb].

OB: cido *in*, *super* (Livy), liquo *in* (V.), trecto *inter* (Nep. 3. 1. 1), tendo *ad* (Tac.) [4 verbs].

PRAE: praeluceo *in* (Cic. Lael. 27) [1 verb].

PRO: cedo *ad*, *in*, cumbo *ad*, *super* (V.), *secundum* (Caes.), deo *in* (Nep. 2. 1. 3), icio *in* (Tac. 3; 31), mereor *de* (Plaut.) [5 verbs].

SUB: puro *ad* (Cato 157. 3), urgeo *ad* (V.) [2 verbs].

Total: Only with prepositions 62 verbs.

#### D. WITH PREPOSITIONS, OR ACCUSATIVE, BUT WITHOUT DATIVE.

AD: cesso *in* (arcesso), cio *in* (Suet.), duco, eo, gredior *ad* (Livy 1. 42. 4), habeo *ad* (Livy), igo *ad* (Caes., Suet.), licio *ad*, mitto, plico *ad*, pono *ad* (Cato), quiro *ad* (Cic.), rigo *in* (Tac.), scendo *in* (V.), scisco *ad* (Cic.) *in* (Tac.), sero *in* (Suet.), tineo *ad* (Ter.), verto *sub* (V.), tollo *ab*, *in* (V.), voco *ad* (Livy) [20 verbs].

CIRCUM: pono *circum* (Cato 115. 2) [1 verb].

CON: (a)go, cito *ad* (Suet.), duco, figo *in* (Nep.), fero, fundo, gero *in* (Ter., Cic.), (co)gito, gredior *in*, *per*, icio, misceo *cum* (Cato 76. 3; 93; 109; 114. 2), *inter* 96, acc. (39. 2; 84); pass. abs. 162. 6, *cum* 103, abl. (V), 3. 633; 4. 120; 161; 6. 762), pel-  
lere, plector *inter* (Nep.), queror *de* (Suet.) sideo *sub* (Sall.), sisto, socio, *inter* (Livy I), tendo, tero, traho, vesto [21 verbs].

IN: cito *ad*, clino *ad*, *in*, cludo *in*, do, duco, flammo *ad*, frio, fundo, gredior *in*, *intra*, licio *ad* (Sall.), pello *in*, ripio *ad* (Suet.), scendo *supra* (Cato), scribo *in*, tendo, tinguo (Cato), vehor, vado *in* (Sall., Tac.), vito *ad*. [19 verbs].

PRAE: cipito, mitto, sentio *in* (Cic.), sumo *in* (Tac.) [4 verbs].

PRO: lato *ad* (Livy I), mulgo *ad* (Sall.) [2 verbs].

SUB: Cito *in* (V. 2. 618), do (Cato), gero *in* (Suet.), pendo (Cato), pono [5 verbs].

Total: 72 verbs.

#### E. WITH NEITHER ACCUSATIVE NOR DATIVE.

*Adpetens*, gen. Cic. P. 7, *circumfluo*. abl., Cic. Lael. 52, *com-*  
*missor*, abl. Hor. 4. 1. 1, *conitor*, abl. V. 5. 264. *indigeo*, gen.,  
Nep. 5. 4. 2; 8. 2. 6; 23. 1. 3; Cic. L. 51, abl., Nep. 17. 7. 2;  
25. 9. 3; 21. 2, Suet. A. 29. 1; 89. 2, *infrendo*, abl. V. 3. 664,  
*inhorreo*, abl. Hor. 1. 23. 5, *innitor*, abl. Caes. 2. 27. 1, Suet. C.  
57 (*in* Nep. 25. 21. 5), *oberro*, abl. Tac. 65, *occido*, abl. V. 2. 581,

*occubo*, abl. V. 1. 547, *obstipesco*, abl. V. 1. 613; 5. 90, *supersedeo*, abl. Caes. 2. 8. 1<sup>1</sup> [13 verbs].

#### SUMMARY OF A-E (Without Dative).

It is to be noted that in the above lists there are 704 verbs with which the dative is never used (452 only with the acc., 105 only in the Pass. abs., 62 only with preps., 72 only with preps. or acc. and 13 with other cases).

#### II. DATIVE IS USED.

##### A. Only with the Dative.

AD: *cresco* (Tac. 19), *cumbo*<sup>1</sup> (V. 1. 79), *fulgeo* (Hor. 4. 5. 7) *glomero* (V. 2. 341), *iaceo* (Tac. 65) *no* (V. 1. 358; 4. 613; 6. 358), *labor* (V., Hor.), *pareo*, *rideo* (Juv. 6. 606), *repio* (Tac. 74), *sentio*, *sentior* (Sall.), *sideo* (Livy 21. 25. 6; 53. 6), *versor* (Nep., V., Tac.) [14 verbs].

ANTE: *cello* (Cic. P. 14, A. 4), (*i*)*sto* (Cato. 156. 1, Nep. 3. 1. 2) [2 verbs].

CON: *dico*, *fido*, *moror* (Ter. 572), *peto* (Suet. C. 40. 1), *seneseo* (Sall. C. 20. 10) [5 verbs].

IN: *cubo*<sup>2</sup> (V. 1. 89; 4. 83; 6. 610; Livy 21. 27. 5), *gnosco*, *haereo* (Livy 1. 28. 10), *labor* (V. 2. 240; 3. 89), *mineo*, *servio* (Nep.), *sidior*, *sulto* (Hor. 3. 3. 41; Livy 1. 48. 2), *surgo* (V., 3. 207, 560, 5. 189) [9 verbs].

INTER: *iaceo* (Livy 21. 30. 11), *venio* (Livy, Suet.) [2 verbs].

OB: *cumbo* (V.), *equito*, *ficieo*, *irascor*, *luctor* (V.), *oedio*, *repto*, *secundo*, *sisto*, *oto*, *strepto*, *sum*, *tempero*, *tingo* (Pl., Ter.), *obvenio*,<sup>3</sup> *versor* [16 verbs].

PRAE: *curro* (Cic. 4. 19), *stolor* (Cic. 1. 24), *sum* [3 verbs].

PRO: *sum* [1 verb].

SUB: *censeo*, *cumbo*, *curro*, *ficieo*, *plico* (Cato, Pl.), *plicor* (Sall.), *rideo* (V.) *sido* [8 verbs].

<sup>1</sup> But contrast *accubo* in Cic. 2. 10, Nep. 16. 3. 2; 17. 8. 2 and *incumbo* ad Cic. 4. 4; P. 19.

<sup>2</sup> *Impleo* is used with the acc. and gen. or abl., *obliviscor* with gen., except acc. V. 2. 148 and Livy 22. 58. 8.

<sup>3</sup> Note that in the authors examined *obeo* always takes the acc.; but *obvenio* always takes the dative, due to the use of *obeo* in a technical sense, with *mortem* or *diem*, to 'die'. See also footnote, p. 293. Note, however, *Obéo Acherontem*, Enn. Sc. 245 (V<sup>2</sup>), and *obéo bella*, Ov., Trist. 22. 30.

TOTAL: Only with Dative 6 verbs,<sup>1</sup> only six being compounds of transitive verbs, *dico*, (*g*)*nosco*, *peto*, *sentio*, *sisto*, *tingo*, and nine compounded of verbs which take a dative in the simple form, *fido*, *haereo*, *irascor*, *luctor*, *parco*, *rideo*, *sumo*, *servio*, *tempero*.

#### B. WITH EITHER ACCUSATIVE OR DATIVE.<sup>2</sup>

*Antecedo*, dat. Ter. 525, *anteo* dat. Suet. A. 64. 3; *circumfundo*, pass. c. dat. Livy 21. 27. 4; 22. 7. 11; 12; *confiteor*, dat. Cic. A. 28, *consulo*, acc. Ter., Cic., Verg., Nep., *contingo*, acc. Verg. 8, Juv. 2, Suet. 2, *incipio*, dat. V., 2. 269, *ineo*, pass. c. dat. Livy 1. 23. 10, *inludo*, acc. (Ter. 915, Tac. 71), pass. abs. (Cic. Cato 65., Lael. 99), dat. (V. 2. 64: 4. 591, Tac. 61) *imprimo*, pass. c. dat. V. 4. 659, *impendeo*, acc. Ter. 180, *inrideo*, acc. (Pl. 657, pass. 785, Ter. 669, Cic. Cato 85, Suet. C. 81. 4, A. 86. 2), dat. Pl. 657, *insisto* acc. V. 6. 563, *insto*, acc. (Nep. 15. 9. 1; 18. 4. 2), dat. (V. 1. 504; 5. 168, Juv. 6. 407), *obsequor*, acc. Ter. 79, dat. Cato 5. 6, Pl. 306, Cic. L. 35, Nep. 25. 2. 2, Juv. 10. 393), *occurro*, acc. V. 5. 36, (Cic. 3. 16 with *obeo*, etc.), *praevertio*, pass. c. dat. Pl. 460, *prospicio*, acc. 16, dat. 6, *provideo*, acc. 19, dat. 5 (Sall. J. 62. 1; 90. 1, Cic. 2. 19; 3. 4, L. 6) [19 verbs].

#### C. WITH A DATIVE OR A PREPOSITION.

*Accido ad*, Suet. C. 20. 4; *adequito*, dat. Livy 1. 14. 7; 22. 42. 4, *ad* Caes. 1. 46. 1; *adpropinquo ad*, Nep. 3. 3. 3; *adsto*, dat. 2 (Pl. 664, with *contra*, V. 1. 301), preps. 10; *adsum*, dat. 12, preps. 14 (*ad* Ter. 313, Sall. J. 96. 3, V. 2. 732; 5. 57, Livy 1. 52. 5, Suet. C. 84. 3, *apud* Sall. J. 100. 3, *cum* Cic. P. 16, 69, *in* Cic. P. 69, L. 9, 25, Livy, 1. 44. 1; 21. 63. 1); *congruo*, dat. 2 (Nep. 6. 3. 5, Suet. C. 40. 2), preps. 3 (*ad* Livy 1. 5. 5; 19. 6, *cum* Cic. L. 27); *concurro* dat. 1 (V. 1. 493), preps. 4 (*cum* Sall. 60. 2; Nep. 18. 3. 4, *ad* Caes. 3. 22. 4, *in* V. 2. 315); *incido*, dat. Livy 21. 10. 10, preps. 16 (*in* 15, *super* V. 2. 467); *incumbo* dat. 9, *ad* Cic. 4. 4, P. 19; *incurro*, dat. 4 (Sall. J. 101. 8, Livy 22. 17. 6, pass. Juv. 6. 331, V. 2. 409?), *in* (Sall. C. 60. 7; J. 97. 4, Cic. Cato 25); *insum* dat. 6, preps. 2 (*in* Sall. C. 15. 5, Cic. L. 84); *intercedo* dat. 2 (Caes. 1. 43. 6; Tac. 13), preps. 4 (*pro* Suet. C. 30. 1, *in* Nep. 10. 1. 3, Cic. Cato 77, *inter* Caes. 2. 17. 2); *praesideo in*

<sup>1</sup> Excluded are: *accido* with *ad*, Suet. C. 20. 4, *annuo*, acc. c. dat. V. 1. 250, *impendeo* with acc. Ter. 180, *indulgeo*, acc. c. dat. Suet. A. 41. 1, *subvenio*, acc. c. dat. Sall. J. 85, 48; 99. 3. See C. *infra*.

<sup>2</sup> The unusual construction is given in the following list.



Sall. J. 85. 48; 99. 3, *pro* Suet. A 26. 3; *procedo* dat. 2 (Cato 148. 1, Pl. 467), preps. frequent.<sup>1</sup>

Total: 14 verbs.

It is to be noted that there are 704 verbs with which a dative is never used, only 61 with which a dative is always used, and that from this point of view the value of the rule is only 7.9%.

### III. NOTEWORTHY COMPOUNDS.<sup>2</sup>

*Accedo*, acc. 16, dat. 8, preps. 37. (Note *propius* Caes. 1. 46. 1, Nepos 1. 7. 2, Livy 21. 24. 3).

*Accommodo*, acc. 3, acc. c. dat. 4, acc. c. *ad* 4.

*Addo*, acc. 75, acc. c. dat. 34, c. *ad* 4, c. *in* 3.

*Adiungo*, acc. 8, acc. c. dat. 12, c. *ad* 5.

*Adsuefacio*, acc. c. dat., Livy 21. 3. 4, pass. c. abl. Caes. 4. 1. 9; 4. 3. 4 (?), Livy 1. 46. 7, Suet. A. 64. 2.

*Comparo*, acc. 26, acc. c. dat. 1 (Cic. Cato., 14) c. *cum* 3; pass. abs. 25, with *cum* 3, with *ad* (Cic. Cato. 64).

*Concedo*, acc. 12, acc. c. *cum*, 9, acc. c. dat. 2 (Cato 138, Sall. J. 7. 7); pass. c. dat. 2 (Sall. J. 14. 14, Cic. Cato 59), c. *cum* 7, c. *inter* 1 (V. 1. 412).

*Incedo*:<sup>3</sup> acc. 6 (Livy 1. 17. 4; 56. 10; 22. 12. 5, Tac. 16. 40, 61), dat. 2 (Sall. C. 31. 3, Tac. 51), preps. 3 (*in* Sall. J. 10. 17, *ad* V. 1. 497, *per* V. 1. 188).

*Indulgeo*: dat. 17, acc. c. dat. 2 (Juv. 6. 384, Suet. A. 41. 1), acc. 1 (Tac. 52<sup>4</sup>).

*Impono*: acc. 26, dat. 1 (Nep. 18. 5. 7), acc. c. dat. 28, preps. 8 (*in* 5, *ad* Cato 157. 3, Livy 22. 19. 4, pass., *insuper* Cato 18. 5).

*Praesto*: acc. 25,<sup>5</sup> dat. 7, acc. c. dat. 5, abl. 1 (Sall. C. 37. 5).

*Subeo*, acc. 25, dat. 6, all in Vergil (3. 292; 5. 176; 203; 346; 6. 812), abl. 2 (V. 2. 708; 4. 599), *ad* 1 (Livy 1. 28. 5).

*Succedo*, dat. 15, acc. 2 (Caes. 2. 6. 2,<sup>6</sup> Livy 22. 28. 12), *ad* 2 (Caes. 4. 3. 2, Livy 1. 27. 5), *sub* 1 (Caes. 1. 24. 4), *in* 3 (Caes. 4. 32. 2, Nep. 15. 7. 3, Livy 21. 3. 2).

<sup>1</sup> Excluded: *obnitor*, dat. Tac. 21, *in* V. 5. 206, abl. V. 4. 406.

<sup>2</sup> For complete particulars regarding the usage of verbs from A-C cf. Thesaurus Ling. Lat. Cf. also p. 289.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Arch. f. Lat. Lex. IX, p. 113, Schmalz Antib. I<sup>7</sup>, p. 706 f., C. F. W. Mueller, Der Akkusativ p. 136.

<sup>4</sup> Add to Mueller, *ibid.* p. 137.

<sup>5</sup> Add to Draeger, H. S. I<sup>2</sup>, p. 380 for Nepos, with acc.: 1. 2. 3; 24. 2. 3; 25. 15. 1, and with dat. 19. 2. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Omitted by C. F. W. Mueller, *l. c.* p. 141, as also Suet. A. 96. 1.

*Supersedeo*: abl. Caes. 2. 8. 1, dat. Suet. A. 96. 1<sup>1</sup> (cf. also Nero, 11. 2).

## CONCLUSION.

1) In view of the fact that the value of this rule is only 14.3%, that in the standard prose of Cicero and Caesar its value is only 13.5%, that in the active these compounds take the accusative 3863 times, the dative only 601 times, with a resulting value of 13.4%, one conclusion inevitably follows, that the rule must either be abolished entirely, or so modified as to be in harmony with the above facts.

2) The fact that there are 704 compounds with which the dative is never used and only 61 with which the dative is always used, the value, therefore, being only 7.9%, also points to the same conclusion.

3) In view of the fact that there are 19 compounds that are used with either an accus. or a dat., that there are 14 that have only the dative or a preposition, that there are a number of verbs like *accedo* that take either an accus. or a dat., or a preposition, it follows that regard must be had not so much to the group of letters found at the beginning of the verb, as to the *meaning* of the verb in its totality. We follow this method of procedure with other verbs, whether compounds or not, and thus determine which one of the six cases is to be used.

4) As the object of language is to convey meaning, it is obvious that the only rational basis for a rule is the *meaning* of the word. It, therefore, follows that if the rules in the grammar do not include the particular meaning that will account for the dative, the rules must be modified so as to include the desired meaning. Several grammars recognize this fact, and add a note to the effect that, if the dative is used it may be caused by the compound having the meaning "favor, help, please, trust," etc. This is certainly a move in the right direction. Does not the student *feel* the force and the reason for the dative being used with the common *bellum inferre*, when he is told that the accusative *bellum* makes a close compound with the verb and is therefore called the direct object, whereas, the dative, by contrast, makes a less close connection with the verb and is therefore called the indirect object, or even that it is a dative of disadvantage? Is this not better than the

<sup>1</sup> Draeger, H. S. I<sup>2</sup>, p. 419 cites for the dative only Bell. Afr. 75. Cf. also Apul. Mag., p. 285, 19.

usual mechanical answer "dative with a compound of *in*"?<sup>1</sup> The dative is used instead of a preposition to introduce the element of feeling, emotion, interest, whereas the preposition merely expresses a place relation,—the one is warm, the other cold. Furthermore, it is to be noticed that the 61 compounds always used with a dative may be reduced to 51 by the fact that in 10 instances the simple verb is used with a dative (*fido*, *haereo*, *irascor*, *luctor*, *pareo*, *rideo*, *sum* (ob. pro), *tempero*, *servio*), and thus the remainder may be explained as due either to the acquired meaning of the compound being "favor, help, please, trust", etc., or by their use as indirect objects, or as datives of personal interest, or where a preposition would be used in classical prose. It is significant that as early as 1845, Zumpt, *Lat. Gr.*, p. 412, explained the use of a dative with *adpropinquo* and similar verbs as being due to their meaning "approach", and that certainly as early as 1803, and probably in his first edition 1787, Chr. Gottlob Bröder, *Pract. Gram. d. Lat. Spr.*<sup>5</sup> (1803) remarked: "man muss auf den Sprachgebrauch Acht haben".

In reply to a query regarding the originator of the rule in its present form, Professor J. Golling wrote, March 11th, 1912: "Es ist wohl sicher, dass die Regel in der vorliegenden Fassung in den Jahren zwischen 1848-1855 entstanden ist und zwar dürfte F. Schultz der Autor sein".

EMORY B. LEASE.

THE COLLEGE OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK.

<sup>1</sup>In such an answer, it is hardly necessary to say, there lies an absurdity, inasmuch as, if the dative is used, it is not because of the preposition, but in spite of it, there being no prepositions used with the dative in Latin.

### III.—SUBMERGED TABELLAE DEFIXIONUM.

Many tabellae defixionum have been found in ancient wells and springs, and still others bear evidences of having been originally thrown into water.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, directions are given in several passages of the Magic Papyri that defixiones (κάροχοι, καράδεσμοι) are to be cast either into a grave or into some body of water, natural or artificial.<sup>2</sup> The purpose of this custom was, according to Wünsch, "*ut per quam (i. e. aquam) via pateret ad manes eorum, qui naufragio perierunt*".<sup>3</sup> This explanation is accepted by Audollent<sup>4</sup> and is in line with that advanced by Hubert.<sup>5</sup> We, too, regard it as true—as far as it goes—but can hardly grant that it is adequate, for it leaves the origin of the custom still in its primitive obscurity.

The leading social anthropologists are agreed that the association of demons, spirits, or divinities with magic rites is a secondary and comparatively late development.<sup>6</sup> The earliest magic was

<sup>1</sup> Audollent, Auguste, *Defixionum Tabellae*, Paris, 1904, nos. 22-37; 104; 105; 109; 110; 114-120; 129; 262; Wünsch, Richard, *Defixionum Tabellae Atticae*, I. G. III 3, nos. 27; 28; 52.

<sup>2</sup> Wessely, C., *Griechische Zauberpapyrus von Paris und London*, *Denkschrift d. kais. Akad. d. Wissenschaften zu Wien, phil.-hist. Klasse*, XXXVI, 1888, 2te Abt., 27 ff.; *Pap. Anast.* 351; id., *Neue Gr. Zauberpapyri*, *Denk. d. k. Akad. d. W. zu Wien, phil.-hist. Kl.*, XLII, 1893, 96 ff., 443 ff., 456 ff.

<sup>3</sup> D. T. A., pr. iv.

<sup>4</sup> D. T., pr. cxvii.

<sup>5</sup> See under *Magia*, p. 1511, *Daremberg et Saglio, Dict. des Ant. grec. et rom.*

<sup>6</sup> "..... Though magic was thus found to fuse and amalgamate with religion in many ages and in many lands, there are some grounds for thinking that this fusion is not primitive, and that there was a time when man trusted to magic alone for the satisfaction of such wants as transcended his immediate animal cravings." J. G. Frazer, *The Golden Bough* (1911) I, p. 233; cf., pp. 234-235 and p. 235, n.; "La magie sympathique se suffit à elle-même et la magie démoniaque lui est postérieure . . ." Edmond Doutté, *Magie et Religion dans l'Afrique du Nord, Algiers*, 1908, p. 308; cf. p. 307. Years ago Hegel reached the same conclusion by a very different process; see his *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Religion*, I, pp. 220 ff. (vol. XI of the first collected edition of Hegel's works, Berlin, 1832); and Frazer, *op. cit.*, I, p. 423, app.

based solely on the unshaken belief in the efficacy of symbolism. And this is everywhere and at all times the very heart of magic.<sup>1</sup> An act producing a result analogous to a certain desired result, would of itself, according to this belief, under certain prescribed conditions, produce this desired result. This made primitive man a veritable potentate. Moreover, he was scientific so far as he believed in the control of these processes by immutable laws; but he was unscientific so far as he equated analogy and identity. Each man was his own magician for good or evil. But in time he became sensitive to his own limitations and slowly acquired the habit of reinforcing his symbolism by appeals to his deities or by binding them to his service. This addition of one of the elements of religion banished from magic its primitive simplicity and implanted in its place a complex system which finally was elaborated into a ritual.<sup>2</sup> In the mystic haze of this "Götterdämmerung" the primal meaning of many an ancient symbol was, little by little, lost to view and finally forgotten.

Now any one who accepts this theory must admit that Wünsch's explanation of the custom of throwing defixiones into the water relates only to advanced stages of magic. What, then, is the primary stage which this explanation fails to touch? It is the purpose of this paper to determine, if possible, what it is; and if in the process of determination we frequently go outside the narrow field of defixiones into the broader ranges of general magic, it is because in the last analysis all magic rests on the same principles.<sup>3</sup> Defixiones were, in reality, only a highly specialized form of magic confined largely to the Greco-Roman world.

But there are other grounds for believing that Wünsch's explanation is not fundamental. The defixiones which he uses in its support belong without exception to a late period where a contamination of magic and religion was the rule. Nos. 104<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>"Tout acte magique a pour but, soit de mettre des êtres vivants ou des choses dans un état tel que certains gestes, certains accidents, ou certains phénomènes doivent s'ensuivre infailliblement, soit de les faire sortir d'un état analogue." Hubert, *op. cit.*, p. 1518; cf. Morris Jastrow, *Religion in Babylonia and Assyria*, New York, 1911, p. 305.

<sup>2</sup>This does not commit me to the theory of the magical origin of religion.

<sup>3</sup>"Il n'est pas possible de séparer les gestes et les actes symboliques des rites verbaux, oraux ou écrits, quels que soient leurs noms, incantations ou prières." Hubert, *op. cit.*, p. 1518.

<sup>4</sup>=Eph. Epig. VII, p. 278, no. 827; Hübner, *Exempla*, 947.



and 129<sup>1</sup> of Audollent's collection are assigned to the second century A. D.; likewise the famous tablet from Salernum,<sup>2</sup> which, while not consigned to the water itself, embodies in its formula the submersion of a hair belonging to the intended victim. The remaining tablets of this class give no hint as to the mental processes of the defixentes. With only one exception, all the other references cited by Wünsch<sup>3</sup> and Hubert<sup>4</sup> are drawn from sources ranging from the first century to the eleventh century of our era. The exception is found in the ancient Hylas-legend, which is probably one of the many forms of the cult of the dead.<sup>5</sup> This shows that Wünsch's explanation might possibly apply to pre-Christian magical operations, yet it is altogether too indirect in its bearing and of too uncertain an antiquity to allow one to deduce from it alone their initial signification.

We shall now consider a number of magic practices, ancient, medieval, and modern. For very obvious reasons they will be presented as far as possible in chronological order.

Among the Assyrians a man was regarded as possessing a very effective counter-charm if he placed little images in the model of a ship floating in a basin, and then broke the model to pieces to the accompaniment of the following formula :

"She who hath bewitched me, hath laid me under a spell,  
Hath cast me into the river flood,  
Hath cast me into the river depth,  
Unto the witch hath said 'Bewitch',  
Unto the enchantress hath said 'Enchant',  
May this be as her ship,  
Like this ship may she be wrecked,  
May her spell be wrecked, and upon her  
And upon her image may it recoil,  
May her cause fail, but let mine succeed."<sup>6</sup>

Of the same character is an operation described in the Old Testament (Jer. li, 60-64): "So Jeremiah wrote in a book all

<sup>1</sup> = CIL XI 1823.

<sup>2</sup> Aud. 210 = CIL X 511; cf. Wünsch, D. T. A., pr. xxix, col. i.

<sup>3</sup> Viz.: Kaibel, Epigr., 571 (D. T. A. pr. xxix); Diog. Laer. VIII, § 31; Lyd. de mens. IV, 52; Paus. II 37, 5; Magic Pap., see p. 301, n. 2 (D. T. A., pr. iv).

<sup>4</sup> Eunap. in Porph., p. 10; Greg. Nyss. V, Greg. Thaum., 308; Psellus περὶ ἐνεργ. δαιμ., ed. Boissonade, p. 21, n. 2 (op. cit., p. 1511, n. 5).

<sup>5</sup> G. Türk, De Hyla, Diss., Breslau, 1895; E. Maass, Deut. Litt.-Zeit., XVII (1896), 7 ff. (Wünsch, D. T. A. pr. iv).

<sup>6</sup> J. C. Thompson, Semitic Magic, p. 154.

the evil that should come upon Babylon, *even* all these words that are written against Babylon. And Jeremiah said to Seraiah, When thou comest to Babylon, and shalt see, and shalt read all these words; Then shalt thou say, O Lord, thou hast spoken against this place, to cut it off, that none shall remain in it, neither man nor beast, but that it shall be desolate for ever. And it shall be, when thou hast made an end of reading this book, *that* thou shalt bind a stone to it, and cast it into the midst of the Euphrates: and thou shalt say, Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise from the evil that I will bring upon her. . . . .<sup>1</sup>

To the same class virtually belongs the famous oath of the Phocaeans, for, says Wellhausen, "Der Eid ist ein eventueller Fluch, sei es dass man sich selbst verflucht, oder, wie bei der Beschwörung, Andere".<sup>2</sup> These loyal Hellenes cast into the sea a mass of molten iron and said: "μη πριν ἐς Φωκαίην ῥῆξιν, πριν ἢ τὸν μύδρον (i. e. σιδήρεον) τοῦτον ἀναφῆναι".<sup>3</sup> When Xerxes cast the fetters into the Hellespont<sup>4</sup> he was restraining it with a twofold bond; first, through the significance of the fetters themselves, and in the second place through the symbolic power of the fact that they would sink too deep in the water for the angry waves of the surface to control them. We shall later on consider a modern instance analogous to this.<sup>5</sup>

It is related by the Pseudo-Callisthenes<sup>6</sup> that the last native king of Egypt, Nectanebus (358 B. C.), whenever his country was threatened with invasion, would fill a bronze vessel with water to resemble the sea. In it he floated tiny ships of wax that represented the fleet of the enemy, and in the ships he placed small waxen figures of men; then . . . ἐπεκαλεῖτο ὡσανεὶ τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν ἐπιδῶν, καὶ τὰ αἰρία πνεύματα καὶ τοὺς καταχθονίους δαίμονας. Καὶ τῇ ἐπιδῇ ἔμπνοα ἐγίνοντο τὰ ἀνθρωπάκια ἐν τῇ λεκάνῃ, καὶ οὕτως ἐβαπτίζοντο. Εὐθέως δὲ, βαπτιζομένων αὐτῶν, τὰ ἐν τῇ θαλάσῃ ἀληθῆ πλοῖα τῶν ἐπερχομένων πολεμίων διεφθείροντο . . . . . Whether the author here records the magician's express purpose in invoking the spirits, or only a current explanation of the purpose, it is clear that the spirits

<sup>1</sup> A. V.

<sup>2</sup> Reste Arabischen Heidentums, p. 192.

<sup>3</sup> Herod. I 165; cf. Hor. Epodes, XVI, 17-21.

<sup>4</sup> ἐκέλευε . . . . . κατεῖναι ἐς τὸ πέλαγος πεδέων ζεύγος (Herod. VII 35).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. note 1, p. 307.

<sup>6</sup> Hist. Fab., I, 1; see E. A. W. Budge, Egyptian Magic, pp. 91 ff.; Thompson, op. cit., pp. 155-156.

served only to infuse life into the waxen figures, which were then regarded as possessed of the personality of the enemy. The destruction of the one was therefore *ipso facto* the destruction of the other and in precisely the same manner.

We must now consider the defixiones once more, but at greater length.<sup>1</sup> The significant part of Aud. 104 reads: Q(ui) mihi ma(n)telu(m) in[u]olauit, | sic liqu(e)at <c> com-(odo) aqua | ell[a] m[u?]ta, ni q(ui) eam [sa]luauit | Annus etc. The statement that the *defigens* invoked the deities of the spring in which the tablet was flung, rests solely on a conjecture suggested by the next tablet to be considered.<sup>2</sup> This tablet (Aud. 129) in symbol consigns a certain Q. Letinius Lupus to the waters of the spring "uti uos A|quae feruentes, | siu[e u]os Nimfas [si]ue quo alio no|mine uoltis adpel[l]ari, uti uos eu|m interemates | interficiates | intra ann|um itum (=istum)". The meaning of this is beyond dispute. But the *defixio* from Salernum (Aud. 210) requires close scrutiny before its import becomes clear. The best editors read it—Locus capillo| ribus (=rius) | expect[at cap]lut su|um,<sup>3</sup> a satisfactory English equivalent of which is—"The stream in which the hair now lies awaits the head whence it came". Now to the magician of all periods the hair is identical with the man.<sup>4</sup> To submerge a hair is therefore tantamount to drowning the man. This tablet is then merely a leaden record deposited in a tomb to remind the lower deities that the victim was already magically drowned and to bind them to making this manner of death a reality.

The Magic Papyri, too, require a more detailed consideration than was given them earlier in this paper.<sup>5</sup> One of the recipes tells how to overcome an opposing charioteer. The operator is to write his wish on a leaden plaque, perform certain ceremonies, and "... παρὰ ποταμὸν ὅψε ἡ μέσης νυκτὸς ὅπου ῥοὺς ἐστὶν ἡ παραρίου βαλανίου ἢ εἰς θάλασσαν δῆσας αὐτῷ (=αὐτὸ) σπάρτω βάλε..."<sup>6</sup> The clause, ὅπου ῥοὺς ἐστὶν, is noteworthy. A little farther along the same formula offers a choice of depositories for the plaque:

<sup>1</sup> See p. 302, n. 4; p. 303, nn. 1-2.

<sup>2</sup> See Aud., p. 158, ad loc.

<sup>3</sup> Aud., p. 281, ad loc.; Wünsch D. T. A., pr. xxix; Mommsen, CIL, X 511.

<sup>4</sup> Doutré, op. cit., p. 445; Thompson, op. cit., pp. 148; 153; Frazer, op. cit., I 65-66; id., Adonis, Attis, Osiris, pp. 33-34; 184; Godfrey Leland, Etruscan Roman Remains in Popular Tradition, pp. 327-329.

<sup>5</sup> P. 301, n. 2.

<sup>6</sup> Wessely, Neue Gr. Zaub. Pap. CXXI, 443 ff.

"... ἡ ποταμὸν ἢ γῆν ἢ θάλασ(σαν) ἤγουν ἢ θήκην εἰς φρέαρ. . . ." <sup>1</sup> Still another formula allows only the alternatives, a river or the sea.<sup>2</sup> A certain form of love-tablet in order to be effective had to be thrown into the sea, and its effectiveness could be greatly augmented if in the same operation magical characters were engraved on a copper nail taken from a wreck.<sup>3</sup> Water from a wreck was stated to be potent in the performance of a certain exorcism; failing that, water from a sunken skiff is prescribed.<sup>4</sup> Water from the former source is also useful as an ἀγωγή ἀσχέτου; he who employs it rightly can secure absolute control over the most ungovernable friend or foe.<sup>5</sup> In the prosecution of a certain evil spell the head of a cock is to be severed and thrown into the river; the person officiating must then lay aside all his garments and immerse himself in the water.<sup>6</sup>

The Romagnola, also, furnishes material for this study. One of the recipes cited by Leland runs on this wise: "Go to a running river, and cast in the stone as violently and as spitefully as you can, saying:

'Non butto questa pietra,  
Ma butto il bene e la fortuna  
Della persona (name appears here) che il bene  
Gli vada nell' acqua corrente  
E così non abbia più bene'."<sup>7</sup>

Another recipe directs that to remove a certain bewitchment the apparatus causing it be cast into running water.<sup>8</sup> This requirement calls to mind the *ρῶνς* of the Magic Papyri.

In his valuable book on modern Greek folklore Lawson tells of a device for injuring an enemy in which the operator may either scrape away the representative image with a knife or throw it into a stream to be disintegrated by degrees; either process causes the victim slowly to pine away.<sup>9</sup> Lawson remarks significantly that the sea is considered more satisfactory magically than any stream.<sup>10</sup> He records another significant incident of the same order which we shall recite in full because of its patent symbolism.

<sup>1</sup> Ib. 456 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Ib. 425 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Ib. 470 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Wessely, Gr. Zaub. Pap., Anast., 65 ff.

<sup>5</sup> Ib. 656 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Ib. 40 ff. That it is an evil spell is clear from the directions for a φυλακτήριον against it, which follow (78 ff.).

<sup>7</sup> Op. cit. p. 339.

<sup>8</sup> Ib. p. 354.

<sup>9</sup> Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion, p. 17.

<sup>10</sup> Ib. p. 20.

It concerns the wife of a priest "who from her wedding-day onward was a prey to various pains and ills. The priest tried in vain to relieve them by prayer, and finally called in a witch to aid him. After performing certain occult rites of divination, she informed him that he must dig in the middle of his court-yard. There he found a tin which on being opened revealed an assortment of pernicious charms—one of his wife's bridal shoes with a large nail through it, a dried-up piece of soap (presumably from the bridal-bath) stuck full of pins, a wisp of hair . . . all in a tangle, and lastly a padlock. The nail and pins were at once pulled out and the hair carefully disentangled, with the result that the woman was freed from her pains and her complicated ailments. But the padlock could not be undone, and was thrown away into the sea, with the result that the woman remained childless".<sup>1</sup>

Similar practices are found among the Celts. As late as 1815 witches have made use of the so-called cursing-wells by casting into them leaden tablets, or suitable substitutes, inscribed with the name of a victim and a curse against him. The spirit dwelling in the well was supposed to put such imprecations into effect.<sup>2</sup> The Scotch Highlanders are said even yet to seek the death of an enemy by fashioning a rude clay image of him, sticking it full of pins, nails, or glass, and then tossing it into a stream to decompose in the running water. In this case the symbol is effective singly.<sup>3</sup>

Besides the body of the foregoing material, which is of the order of execration, there are many half-religious, half-magic rites performed to secure rain and fertility. Reference can be made to these *en bloc*.<sup>4</sup> Most of these find their climax in the submersion of effigies of Death or of old men, or in some cases in the submersion of living men. While there is without doubt some connection between the water expected from heaven and the water of the streams used in the rites, yet the uppermost idea is that the drenching sympathetically puts an end to the old and

<sup>1</sup> *Ib.* p. 17.

<sup>2</sup> J. A. MacCulloch, *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, pp. 196-197.

<sup>3</sup> Frazer, *op. cit.*, I, p. 68; F. B. Jevons, *Anthropology and the Classics*, Lecture IV, p. 110, quoting from *The Albany Review*, iii, 17, p. 532.

<sup>4</sup> Frazer, *op. cit.*, I, 276; 277; III, pp. 234-240; 246-248; 253; W. Warde Fowler, *Roman Festivals*, pp. 111-121; *id.*, *The Religious Experience of the Roman People*, pp. 54-56.



undesirable condition whether it be drought or sterility, or both. These practices have a vogue ranging from the borders of India to the centres of European civilization.

In reviewing the preceding *materia magica* one observes that certain of the rites manifestly favor Wünsch's explanation. Defixio no. 129 of Audollent's compilation and the tablet of the Celtic cursing-well are in this class and can probably be associated inferentially with the Hylas-legend. Some passages of the Magic Papyri, too, are apparently corroborative, but scrutiny shows them to be by no means definite and convergent in their testimony. For example, while Papyrus CXXI, 425 ff., 456 ff., 470 ff., and Papyrus Anastasy, 65 ff., might at first sight seem to support Wünsch, yet on the other hand the *poûs* of Papyrus CXXI, 443 ff. would logically be linked with the running stream which overwhelms and gradually wears away the tokens of the Assyrian, the Tuscan, the Greek and the Scotch Highlander. But even these supports are of doubtful strength, for in the use of water from a sunken skiff in lieu of water from a wreck the symbolism outweighs the suggestion of the intermediacy of water-spirits. In fact, one might safely make the same assertion in regard to the water from an actual wreck, for a wreck does not of necessity imply loss of life, and if the implication is at all present it must have been driven into it through the pressure of analogy, which in magic is identical with symbolism. But all the ceremonies of this order detailed by the compilers of the Magic Papyri are uniformly and satisfactorily explained, if we regard the submersion of the symbols of the victim as the submersion of the victim himself.

When we turn to the residue of the ceremonies we perceive that this explanation is the only one possible. The wording of the Assyrian charm is brimming over with symbolism—"she . . . . . hath cast *me* into the river flood"; "may this be *as* her ship"; "*like* her ship"; "may her spell be wrecked". The enchantress and the enchanter are parrying one another with the same sort of weapon—the false equation of analogy and identity. This, too, was the weapon which Jeremiah put into the hands of Seraiah to wield against Babylon, for the austere monotheist would never have tried to carry out God's behest through the agency of demons. "*Thus* shall Babylon sink", he directs Seraiah to say as the stone-laden scroll disappears in the Euphrates. It was the "*thus*" that was to over-

throw Babylon. The Phocaeans followed this same line of thought; for, as the sea would possess and control the iron to all eternity, so would their oath possess and control them. By the exercise of this same principle Nectanebus defended his country, for his invocation of the gods is plainly secondary in importance. So, too, the peasant of the Romagnola removes a bewitchment from his own life and reduces his enemy to misery, and the modern Greek and the Scotch Highlander bring their enemies to the grave. This symbolism is seen, perhaps, most clearly in the last feature of the Greek charm described at length by Lawson: the padlock was thrown into the sea and the woman remained childless. Just as the deep water was virtually an irrefragable seal on the unopened lock, so an unfathomable ocean of destiny raised itself against the woman's chances of bearing offspring. Further, two of the defixiones themselves add strength to our theory. In Audollent, D. T., No. 104, is registered the desire that the thief may languish just as the water of the fountain ebbs away—*sic liqueat comodo aqua*. This is nothing else than pure symbolism. According to the current interpretation of the Salernitan tablet (Aud. 210), the drowning of the hair is the drowning of the man, an equation possible only to the literal symbolist. Finally, to these conclusions we must add the evident wish behind the water-burial of the effigy or proxy of Death, namely, that just as the waters encompass and overwhelm the tokens, so may the conditions for which the tokens stand be restrained and rendered inoperative.

We are now in a position to sketch the primitive psychology of submerged defixiones, a psychology which was in all probability always present, though in varying degrees of prominence. The symbol, whatever it was, was inscribed with the victim's name. Now to the worker in magic the name is the man himself.<sup>1</sup> The submersion of the symbol is, therefore, the submersion of the man, and the longer the symbol can be kept under water the more permanent will be the victim's plight. Hence it was desirable to hurl the symbol far out into the current of a stream where it would be safely hidden and subject to rapid cor-

<sup>1</sup> Audollent, op. cit., p. xlix; Thompson, op. cit., p. 148; Budge, op. cit., 157; 160-161; Franz Cumont, *Religions orientales dans le paganisme romain*, p. 143; W. Sherwood Fox, *The American Journal of Philology*, XXXIII, 1, Supplement, p. 35.

rosion. But it was still more desirable to cast it into the deep waters of the sea where the eye and hand of man would not reach until the day when the sea will give up its magically as well as its literally dead. Looked at from this point of view this magic practice had everything to commend it to the superstitious and vindictive. It was at once an inexpensive, ready, rapid, secret, and withal self-explanatory process for visiting one's wrath on an enemy.<sup>1</sup> But frequent observation of the fact that the process often failed to bring about the results expected, gradually undermined popular faith in the efficacy of these and other forms of simple symbolism. Men then turned to their gods for aid, arguing that though the gods controlled nature, they in their turn controlled the gods, as their religion clearly demonstrated. At this stage began a very curious blending of magic and religion.<sup>2</sup> In spite of their weakened faith in symbolism as an isolated principle, men were too conservative to make a clean break with their former modes of thought, and consciously retained a certain measure of symbolism in conjunction with the devices which they from time to time borrowed from religion. If we regard the class of *defixiones* under discussion as products of various periods of this stage of magic, they will all be uniformly and satisfactorily explained.

W. SHERWOOD FOX.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY.

<sup>1</sup> Probably the true reason why so few *defixiones* are extant is that this form of magic vengeance was the most popular of all. I share this view with F. B. Jevons, *op. cit.*, p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> Frazer, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 238 ff.

#### IV.—LUCILIUS ON *i* AND *ei*.

1. In the interest of his definition of Lat. *miles* as 'the smiter, smith' (TAPA., 41, 5 sq.)<sup>1</sup> R. G. Kent has worked over the rules given by Lucilius (358-370, Marx) for the differentiation of *i* and *ei* in Latin spelling (A. J. P., 32, 272-293). Some time before, Anderson had come to perfectly sound conclusions regarding our inability to settle any etymological question as between *i* and *ei* by the spelling of Plautine MSS (TAPA., 37, 85).

2. We all know how the changes are wont to be rung on the confusion of *i* and *ei* in inscriptions, a confusion that emerged substantially at 150 B. C., and there are scholars who talk as if the convergence of *ei* to a phonetic identity with *i* was accomplished over night. Niedermann, I am glad to say, in his Latin Phonetics, cautiously dates the confusion as after 200 B. C., and Bennett (Latin Language, § 82) says "about 200 B. C." These are but different statements of Sommer's conclusions in his Grammatik, § 64. If we ever get copious inscriptional material prior to 175 B. C. we may have to say before 200 B. C. Because a Plautine quip turns on the statement that *eira* had a letter more than *era* we cannot infer that original *ei* was still widely different from *i*. Nor am I losing sight of cases like *deicerent* in S. C. de Bacch. (186 B. C.), but I remember that the same inscription preserves ablative final *-d*, without exception, and we know that this *-d* was, in the spoken dialect of Plautus, if not dead as a door-nail, at least in an advanced stage of decomposition. The conclusion may have to be that the orthography of S. C. de Bacch. was as far from exact contemporaneity in regard to its *ei*'s as in regard to its *-d*'s. Now we have on the Spoletium inscription (CIL. II, 4766), certainly prior to 200 B. C., and of a sacral character, fluctuating

<sup>1</sup> The definition is unsatisfactory because it fails to account for the soldier as a unit in a collective group. All Kent's substantial objections to the comparison with *δμιλος* (with distinct military usages) disappear before the *λλ* of Aeolic *δμιλλος* (see Fay, Mod. Lang. Notes, 22, 37). His special objections to my own analysis of *mil-et-* are not here involved, and I reserve my answer for another connection.

final *-d*, and *-ei-* fluctuating with *ī* in *res deina: reidinaī*. The same inscription has *cedito* for *caedito* (or rather *caidito*), but this is pronounced dialectic. Let us call *i* for *ei* dialectic, too, if we admit that our instance shows that the dialects were already getting mixed. We may go further and surmise that the mixture was not due to confusion of locality dialects, but was a thing of class dialects in the same locality. Accordingly, so far as the Plautine quip turning on *eira: era* goes, the reasonable interpretation is that *ei* was pronounced *ē* (closed *ē*), as in COMPROMESISE (S. C. de Bacch., ap. Sommer, l. s. c.). But in high Roman, or what afterwards became high Roman, the word may already have been pronounced *ira*, and Plautus' choice of the (Umbrian-like) variety *ēra* (spelt *eira*) to put in the actor's mouth will have been made by way of preparation for the punning quip with *ēra*.

3. It must be insisted again and again that the answer to the question when *ei* became *i* in spelling, in the orthography of chiselled records, is not an answer to the question when the pronunciation of *ei* and *i* converged. Not only Lucilius, but even Plautus before him, may have written *ei* consistently in words that they pronounced with *ī*, with a consistency at least as great as ours has been in differentiating *sleight* from *slight*.

4. What shall we suppose to be the import of Accius's (b. 170 B. C.) proposal to spell *ī* by *ei*? First, of course, that there was no longer in speech a true diphthong *ei*. Next, as we find *faxseis* with *ei* for *i* on a Mummius (?) inscription (ca. 146 B. C.), we must infer that Accius, taken representatively, was either responsible for this orthography, or followed its lead. It can't make much difference which. The phenomenon is a change of orthographic practise attended by a discussion of spelling reformers. Lucilius, ten years the senior of Accius, but later to emerge in literature, presented rules for differentiating *ī* and *ei*, in opposition to the proposed rules of Accius. I think it will appear when we look into his rules that he never once alludes to any phonetic difference between *ei* and *ī*, that he uses no phonetic term whatsoever, that he never thought of any but the conventional (and mnemonic) aspects of the differentiation, and that not even in his boyhood had he ever heard of a phonetic difference. Marx dates the composition (i. e. publication) of his rules as late as 116-110 B. C.



5. In all brevity, let us state the Lucilian rules as found in Marx's text, vv. 358-371. They are:

1° Spell *pueri* with *ei* "ut puerei plures fiant"; if you spell *pueri* "hoc unius fiet" (vv. 364-366).

2° In *illi* (dat. sg.) "tenue hoc facies *i*", but to *illei* (nom. plur.) "addes *e* ut pinguius fiat" (vv. 369-370).

6. Granting the etymological correctness of rule 1°, though I shall elsewhere challenge the absolute originality of *-ī* as the second declension genitive, it is probable that the dative sg. type of *illi* had an original diphthong (v. Brugmann, Gr<sup>2</sup>, 2. 2, § 361) *-ei* (locatival) which moved toward *-ī* faster than *-oi* in the nom. plural. But so far as the Lucilian rules go he seems to me to be saying what he was taught in his boyhood: when identical singular and plural forms end in *-ī* spell the plurals with *ei* "ut plures vel pinguiores fiant", the singulars with *ī* "ut tenuiores fiant".

7.3° Spell the dative of *fur*, etc., with *-ei* <but the ablv., cf. e. g., *hoc luci*,<sup>1</sup> with *ī*> (vv. 367-8); cf. Quintilian, 1. 7. 15, *ea* <ratio *e* et *i* iungendorum> casibus numerisque discreta est.

The reason for this mnemonic seems to me quite transparent: <dativo> "addes *e*" is the way Lucilius put it. Sorry accident has destroyed the counter rule *ablativo auferes e*. This etymological toying made a perfect mnemonic.

8. So far nothing could be clearer than the motivation lying behind Lucilius's rules, and the grammarians who passed them on—as Quintilian, quoted above—continue to recognize here and there the same motivation. Our difficulties begin with the two last rules, to wit:

5° *meille hominum, duo meilia, item huc e utroque opus, meiles* (358)  
*meilitiam.*

4° *tenues i: 'pilam' in qua lusimus, 'pilum',*  
*quo piso, tenue. si plura haec feceris pila*  
*quae iacimus, addes e peila ut plenius fiat.* (361)

<sup>1</sup> The case of *luci* vs. *luce* had not been finally adjudicated in Varro's time, cf. Lucii <qui> prima luce <nati sunt> (de ling. Lat. 6, 5) with qui luci <natus est> Lucius (ibid. 9. 60). Of course, *luci* is a locatival, like *humi*, and had an original final diphthong *-ai*.

<sup>2</sup> I fancy that Lucilius wrote *meilitiū* and *pilū*, nominatives, and not these ungrammatical accusatives. The *-m* of *pilam* will be a dittography of the succeeding *in*. From this <*m*>, marginally queried, will have come the *m* of *meilitiam*.

After quoting this quatrain Ter. Scaurus (ap. Keil, Gram. Lat., 7, 19. 16) goes on: quam inconstantiam Varro arguens . . . (dicit) in plurali quidem numero debere <e> litterae <i> praeponi, in singulari vero minime. This looks as though Varro rejecting rule 3° accepted rules 1° and 2° and found an application of one of them in 4°. What can be clearer than that Varro understood<sup>1</sup>—what critical examination of them can fail to understand—the words addes e ‘peila’ ut plenius fiat to mean that e is to be added to make ‘peila’ plural? Does not the text of Varro (cf. p. 137, 20 of Goetz and Schoell’s de ling. Lat.), when speaking of the indefinite pronouns, preserve the spelling *infeineileis* (ablv. plur.)?—wherein the two first *ei*’s are perhaps to be attributed to the “plurality” of the “infinite” (cf. on *meille*, § 11), rather than to the Accian orthography.

9. What then does the second part of the quatrain, designated by 4°, mean? Beginning in 359 with *tenuēs i*<sup>2</sup> [for which I should as soon read *tenuēs* <t>, and so in 360 *tenuēs* <t> i, which leaves *plura* to make good sense and grammar] Lucilius says <use> plain <short> i in spelling *pila*[m] at which I played [<of yore> = no longer play, for this is the force of the perfect, *lusimus*], but for *pilum*, wherewith I still pound [cf. *hasta* as used in the Priapea and the obscene sense of *permolere*?] use plain <long> i. He continues: If you make the latter (*haec*) plural (i. e. the *pila* which we hurl) you must add e so that *p*<e>*ila* will become <a> fuller <word>. This rendering assumes that *pila* ‘javelins’ is the plural of *pilum* ‘pestle’. Suppose that, by definition, *pilum* meant to Lucilius neither expressly ‘pestle’ nor ‘javelin’ but ‘pounder’, why not admit that its plural meant <‘far> pounders’ connoting ‘javelins’? We know *habena* as a ‘strap’ (of a javelin, in Lucan, 6, 221), as a ‘lash’ or ‘whip’, but in the plural as ‘reins’ (cf. canting *ribbons*), whereas to Lucilius it may always and only have meant ‘holder’. Do we regard *pestle* (‘pounder’ in a mortar) as a different word from *pestle* (an officer’s *bâton*), or *mortar* (and pestle) as a different word from *mortar* (a piece

<sup>1</sup> Lindsay’s treatment of these lines in his Lat. Lang., p. 27, is quite perfunctory.

<sup>2</sup> If *tenuēs* is a technical verb = *tenuē facias* (cf. v. 369, ‘hoc illi factum est uni’, *tenuē hoc facies i*), it is perfectly admissible (pace Kent) in a censure of Accius’s new proposal for spelling *i*, and nobody going on to 369 would have found difficulty in understanding the verb *tenuare*.

of artillery)? The two senses we give to *pilum* have already been properly rubricated (in Lewis and Short, e. g.) as different aspects of one word?<sup>1</sup>

10. The rule—or examples—given in 4° continued to live in the grammarians. Thus Ter. Scaurus (ap. Keil, 7. 32, 21 sq.). after allocating  $\bar{i}$  to the sg. and *ei* to the plural, goes on (as emended by Göetz and Schoell in their Varro, de ling. Lat., p. 208): si autem cum eadem [i] littera aliud breve aliud longum est, ut illa [et] pila, apices ibi poni debent . . . super I tamen litteram apex non ponitur: melius enim I <in> pila in longum producetur. Now the example *pila* here chosen can only mean that, following Lucilius, Varro includes in his rule both *pila*<sup>2</sup> 'ball' and *pila* 'pounders'.

11. If Varro's objection (cf. § 8) to the inconsistency of Lucilius does not lie against rule 3°—but the quotation fails to prove that it does—it would lie against the examples in rule 5°, viz.: *meille* in contrast with the plural *meillia*, and against *ei* in the singulars *meiles* and *meilitia*, all of which, if we punctuate with Marx, we must spell with *ei*. Now in spite of its being a grammatical singular, *meille* falls well within the rule for plurals and Lucilius or his teacher, any promoter of a mnemonic system, may have spelt *mille* with *ei* 'ut sive pinguius sive plenius fieret'. But why *meiles* and *meilitia*? Perhaps also because, and in Lucilius, too (cf. 405, 490 M.), they were often collectives = soldiery.

12. But Lucilius may have spelt *meiles* as he spelt *meilia* in the belief that *meiles* was derived from *mille*, cf. Varro, de ling. Lat., 5, 89, milites quod trium milium primo legio fiebant ac singulae tribus Titiensium, Ramnium, Lucerum milia militum<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> By a very simple emendation we could add *ut* or *et* (with the sense of 'like' or 'as well as') to the end of 360, giving si plura haec feceris, pila <ut or et> | quae iacimus, which would allow of taking *pilum* 'pestle' as a different word from *pilum* 'javelin'. Postpositive *ut* is thoroughly Lucilian (Marx cites in his index delphinus ut olim, 284; pauper uti, 445; canes ut, 1221, a line end—all, to be sure, without a sequent relative clause), and *et* at the line end, whether after vowels or consonants, occurs a dozen or more times in Horace's hexameter poetry.

<sup>2</sup> Kent would read in Lucilius *pilam* ('mortar') in qua pinsimus because Vel. Longus (ap. Keil, 7. 56. 13) has itemque peila quibus milites utuntur per e et i scribenda existimat at pilam qua pinsitur per i—as though this were not easily and quite certainly a textual mistake for pilum quo pinsitur, replacing in Longus' text Lucilius' pilum quo piso.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. milia militum octo, Ennius, Ann. 332.

mittebant. This derivation is so natural that we need not suppose Varro imagined it on the basis of *χίλι-ἀρχης* (Herodotus), *χιλίαρχος* (Aeschylus), *χίλιοι λογάδες* "The Thousand" (Argos), all implying a levy or classification by thousands. All such designations, however, may have arisen before the word for 'thousand' had become preciser than 'troop, squadron, force'.

13. There remains to quote a curious grammatical comment on our Lucilius quatrain (rules 5° and 4°) from Mar. Victorinus (ap. Keil, 6. 17. 25): *denique omnes qui de orthographia scripserunt de nulla scriptura tam diu quam diu de hac quaerunt, quae per i litteram singularem genetivum et [quae] per ei litteras nominativum pluralem faciat, locuti partim acute <partim>, ut mihi quidem videtur, inepte, illud etiam ridicule (nam mihi quaedam succurrunt): pilum aiunt militare et vineam, si sit subter quam milites aggerem instituunt, et sicam et sicilem [quae secet]<sup>1</sup> per e et i scribenda; at si pilum sit quo pinsitores utuntur, et vinea quae ruri colitur et fistula<sup>2</sup> per i. Absurd enough all this seems regarded logically, i. e., with our present logic, but not so bad as a mnemonic, approximately this: "meiles and meilitia and things 'meilitary' with ei not i", and the rule grew up so naturally from the mistaken notion that Lucilius' 'peila (quae iacimus)' differed in its singular from his 'pilum (quo piso)'.*

14. To restate rules 4° and 5°, as I understand them:

4° Spell *pila* (ball) and *pilum* (pestle) <spite of their quantity difference> with plain i; the plural of *pilum* <when it commonly shifts its sense to> 'javelins' with *ei*, to make it fuller.

5° Because of its intrinsic plurality *meille*, as well as *meilia*, should be spelt with *ei*. Similarly also the <cognate?> words *meiles* and *meilitia* <? because, as generally used, they are collectives>.

EDWIN W. FAY.

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS.

<sup>1</sup> Emendavi (mss. silicem) et seclusi. For the *sicilis* as a military tool or weapon see Ennius ap. Fest. 500, 18, *incedit veles vulgo sicilibus latis*, the definition of Festus being *siciles* 'hastorum spicula alta' [? *lata*].

<sup>2</sup> In the sense of hand-mill. The mnemonics suggest that in this sense the spelling of *fistula* was dictated by the spelling of *pila* 'mortar' or *pilum* 'pestle'. In this sense *fistula* will belong with the root *bhēy* 'ferire'; cf. A. J. P., 32, 403 sq.

## V.—A CAMPAIGN OF EPIGRAM AGAINST MARCUS ANTONIUS IN THE CATALEPTON.

The arrangement of poems in the *Catalepton* disguises the existence of two distinct groups, the one friendly and the other polemical. The former group throws light upon the membership of the Augustan Circle revealing the intimacy of Vergil and *Tucca* (i), the preceptual leadership of *Varius* (vii), and the affectionate character of *Octavius Musa* (iv and xi); the more distant connection of *Messalla* may be inferred from the ninth, while the last (xiv) shows due regard for *Augustus*; Vergil's eager anticipations of pleasure from the instruction of *Siro* the Epicurean, and perhaps his grief at his death, may be seen in the fifth and the eighth.

Touching the remaining poems, which are sharply satirical in the rougher manner of *Catullus* and rendered enigmatic by the use of pseudonyms, it is not self-evident that they constitute a group nor that *Marcus Antonius* and men of his set are the targets of the poet's shafts. Yet the undoubted recognition in Nos. ii and x of attacks upon *T. Annius Cimber* and *P. Ventidius Bassus*, notorious henchmen of *Antony*, and that too in the year 43 when animosity was at its height and *Cicero* was delivering the *Philippics*, suggests the interpretation of other poems as a part of the campaign against *Antony*, an assumption that is strengthened by a number of known facts and is not contradicted by a demonstrable inconsistency or rival hypothesis. Besides this, we might well expect the ambitious son of a thrifty landed citizen to join in the outcry against the anarchistic conduct of *Caesar's* lieutenant.

Firm ground for a beginning is afforded by the second epigram, which, although nameless itself, is positively stated by *Quintilian* (8, 3, 28) to refer to a certain *Cimber* who is well known for the grilling he receives in the *Philippic xi* 14. Since both epigram and oration make capital of *Cimber's* murder of his own brother, the two must belong to the same campaign of vituperation and may be placed in the early part of 43 B. C. I offer a text, translation, and brief explanation of the epigram because



it is elliptical in style and commonly regarded as corrupt and almost uninterpretable.

Corinthiorum amator iste verborum,  
iste iste rhetor! namque quatenus totus  
Thucydides, Brittannus! Attice febris!  
Tau Gallicum, min et spin, ut male illisit,  
ita omnia ista verba miscuit fratri.

'It's Corinthian words he's enamoured of, yon ass of a rhetorician! For he's no more a sheer Thucydides than he is a Briton! Attic delusion! As he jumbled his stupid *tau Gallicum*, his *min* and his *spin*, so he compounded a dose of all that kind of words for his brother'.

He probably poisoned his brother. Cicero makes two puns on the man's name and his crime in Phil. xi 14. *Corinthian* means archaic, transferred from bronzes; *Brittannus*: type of the outlandish; *tau Gallicum*: explained by Kaibel (Rhein. Mus. 44 p. 316) as a cross for crucifixions, but I cannot connect this with the poem; I suggest that the question is one of aspiration as in Catullus lxxxiv, and that the Gallic pronunciation of *th* may have something to do with it. The Gallic *θ* occurs in inscriptions (C. I. L. xii index under *Litterarum formae*). Cimber, whose father had a Greek servile name (Phil. xi 14), was probably a Graecized Gaul and may have spoken with a Gallic accent. The absurdity of his style is suggested by a letter of Augustus quoted by Suetonius (86).

Hardly less certain is the identification of Sabinus in No. x with P. Ventidius Bassus who, as praetor in 43, was declared a public enemy along with Antony, but afterwards had brilliant success as his lieutenant in the East and triumphed over the Parthians. Unless this Ventidius be the same as Vergil's Sabinus, we are confronted, not with two portents alone, as Buecheler has it (Rhein. Mus. 38 p. 519), but with three: first and second, that two muleteers should have reached a curule chair, and third, that they should have done so simultaneously. Had such an unnatural event transpired, surely the elder Pliny would have noted it in his Natural History when he told the story of Ventidius (vii 43 135). It is a slight objection that Ventidius was originally from Picenum while our satire says, speaking of Gaul,

tua stetisse ultima ex origine dicit in voragine.

He was carried as an infant, Aulus Gellius tells us (xv 4), in the

triumphal procession of Pompeius Strabo after the subjugation of his native land and there is nothing to show that the rest of his childhood and youth were not spent in muddy Gaul. One must remember the straits of the parody and refrain from pressing the *ultima ex origine* of Catullus to mean that Ventidius was born in Gaul instead of being carried there as an infant. The other difficulty, arising from the three cognomina, may be diminished to a minimum: if Ventidius chose to call himself Sabinus *licentia candidatorum*, he may have had some right to do so since the Sabines had occupied Picenum before the Romans, and if he be the Sabinus of Cicero's *ad fam.* xv 20 1, we have evidence there that he possessed the features of the race he claimed. The earlier cognomen, *Quintio*, a servile name (C. I. L. x 6269, and index), may well have been hurled at any muleteer by passengers or humorous neighbors; names, like vessels, are made for honor and for dishonor, and many fail to get recorded in the census. These explanations may fall short of certainty but we prefer them to the three portents mentioned above.

Nos. vi, xii, and xiii we believe to be aimed at Antony himself. It is possible that xii and xiii are placed in juxtaposition because they explain each other. The former is a kind of charivari on the occasion of Antony's marriage to his cousin Antonia, whose only sister, it is here insinuated, is not herself averse to receiving Antony's attentions; in consequence, this sister may well be the *prostituta soror* of xiii 7-9, whose intimacy is there cast up to whoever is the subject of the satire. Antony is called *Noctuius*, a fictitious cognomen from *noctua* like *Corvinus* from *corvus*, because of his orgies by night and lethargy by day, to which Plutarch gives express testimony (*Vita ix*). *Atilius*, which must be a pseudonym since *Noctuius* is coined for the occasion, is a scornful way of denoting the exiled and reprobate uncle, C. Antonius, by enigmatic reference to the famous patriot, M. Atilius Regulus. This uncle and father-in-law of Antony, if he be Atilius, seems to have preferred the vulgar *hirnea* as a drinking vessel: hence the explanation of

Adeste nunc, adeste: ducit ut decet  
Superbus ecce Noctuius *hirneam*,

in xii, and also the *hirneus patruus* in xiii 39, both of which Scaliger had spoiled by reading *herniam* and *herniosi* against the best MS. Nos. xii and xiii are also linked together by the use of

*thalassio*, which in the former is a mocking echo of Antony's shameless use of this exclamation as witnessed in xiii 16.

No. xiii expresses the jubilation of Vergil at the imminent downfall of some notorious person, which is instantly anticipated because of his crimes, debauchery, and bankruptcy, a combination that, in this period especially, points strongly to Antony. The threatened rebuke of Caesar, suggested in the *improbande Caesari*, l. 7, points in the same direction and reminds us of the indignation caused among the citizens by Antony's conduct during Caesar's absences (Plutarch, ix). The date of the poem can be readily fixed in 45 B. C. before the reconciliation with Caesar on his return from Munda and while yet the Romans were rejoicing at Antony's embarrassment over the demand of payment for Pompey's house and the threat of distraint. The occasion is aptly described in the following words of the Second Philippic, 74: *Haerebat nebulo: quo se verteret non habebat*. The reconciliation that disappointed Rome is mentioned *ibid.* 78.

The first six lines of xiii are autobiographical, seeming to describe the winter campaign of Dyrrachium and the midsummer conflict of Pharsalus, to which the poet may have owed his loss of health. We read next of *furta* and *stupra*, about which we have more particular information from Cicero: Phil. ii 41 and 62; 44 and 45 entire. Next comes an illustration of his enjoyment of vulgar feasts and amusements; Antony was a capital "mixer" (Plut. Vita iv, ix, and xliii). The last eight lines speak of imminent bankruptcy and worthless brothers, of whom we know enough from the Philippics. The text of the poem is still in need of careful editing, but the parallelism of the whole work with the Second Philippic is as manifest as it ever will be. To deny the connection is to lead us nowhere.

Four poems of the group remain. No. vi I have discussed already (A. J. P. XXXII, p. 451) but it may be added that the *stupor* of Nocturnus, here ridiculed, reminds us of many passages in the Second Philippic such as: *Sed stuporem hominis vel dicam pecudis attendite* (Phil. ii 30); recall also the *βραδεία αίσθησις* ascribed to Antony in Plutarch (xxiv). It might also be suggested that the girl whose character is so neatly slurred in this epigram may be Cytheris, the *mima* of the Philippic, whose wit is contrasted to Antony's stupidity, Phil. ii 20: *Aliquid enim salis a mima uxore trahere potuisti*. Moreover the refusal of the lady to go to the country, mentioned in the epigram, may have been

the occasion of the separation which Cicero scornfully calls a divorce (Phil. ii 69). It is regrettable that we know so little of the uncle C. Antonius, but Cicero was true to his worthless colleague all his life long and for this reason much of the truth is concealed. However, what we do know gives us no justification for not believing worse.

In No. v the poet bids farewell to the rhetoricians and the unchaste muse, but he must take a final fling at one Sextus Sabinus, who may well be Sextus Clodius, the rhetorician who received 2000 jugera of Leontine land for teaching Antony how to make an ass of himself (Phil. ii 63). The *Sabinus* will be but mockery of his Sicilian origin (Suetonius, De Rhet. 5).

After an interval of a couple of years we find the Vergil family anticipating with resignation the loss of their lands in Transpadane Gaul. The reference occurs in the address to the Villa of Siro, No. viii: *si quid de patria tristius audiero*. Its interest in this connection is the key it affords to the poet's hatred of Antony. The Vergil family were typical of that thrifty, moral, landed class which cared more for peace and prosperity than for political ideals. They loved the name of Caesar who had bestowed upon Gaul the liberty the Republic had denied, but when the preservation of their acres depended upon the success of Decimus Brutus, one of the assassins, they forgot their grief in detestation of that *bête noire* of people with property, Marcus Antonius.

Our group of invectives, after an interval of more than a decade, is followed by an epigram upon the death of Antony (No. iii), which, exhibiting as it does the sad reflectiveness common to the Greek Anthology with the Aeneid, possesses a unique significance for our knowledge of Vergil's reading and the affinities of his thought and feeling. The confident statement of Buecheler (Rhein. Mus. 38 p. 511), which has not met with marked dissent, that no Roman whatever can be thought of as the subject of this poem, serves to remind us forcibly how extremely difficult it is to realize the high preëminence of Antony's name in the whole Roman world from the time of Caesar's assassination until the flight from Actium, and the fearful anxiety of Italy until the future of the government was finally decided. Nettleship was a victim of the same prepossession, or rather forgetfulness, in referring the poem to Phraates IV, king of Parthia, a theory we admit having entertained for a time (A. J. P. XXXII, p. 451). Buecheler's view, that Alexander is the subject, not only reduces

the poem to a cold, scholastic or juvenile exercise and renders it a strange exception among intimate, autobiographical pieces, but meets an obstinate block of stumbling in the mention of 'exile' (line 8). Those who stand for Alexander interpret this as a euphemism for Orcus (Christensen), or as the deprivation of burial in his native land (Buecheler), or refer it to the wanderings of his corpse (Birt). I leave men to judge for themselves whether any of these is convincing, but the puzzlement of the doctors, it must be observed, tells strongly against the Alexander hypothesis. Neither are we prepared to believe that the invasion of Italy by Alexander was ever so much feared as to justify the trepidation of line 5, while no one is ignorant of the terror inspired at Rome by the approach of Cleopatra's paramour. On the other hand, if we assume that Antony is meant, there is nothing that will not fit when once we reconceive the nature of Rome's outlook while yet Octavianus was distrusted and almost despised, and his rival was the master of the East and the darling of the legions. We add a translation and some references to support our view.

'Behold a man, whom, by a powerful kingdom's strength supported, Glory had raised on high, to heaven's very thrones. This man the whole wide world with war had shaken, the might of Asia's princes and her peoples he had shattered. Yet but a little while and he had brought to thee, O Rome, the bitterness of slavery, for by the prowess of his spear all else had fallen, when on a sudden, the issue of decisive struggle pending, downward headlong he fell from fatherland to exile driven. Thus does the goddess will; at such behest without a moment's warning the faithless hour deals the mortal's doom'.

First couplet: *regno*: Egypt; the man is not called a king yet he has a kingdom at his back. *Subnixum*: a prose word affected by Vergil; cf. Aen. i 462 *solioque alte subnixa resedit* (*Dido*). Personification of Gloria: Aen. x 144 *sublimen Gloria tollit*. *Sedibus*: Aen. vi 152 *sedibus hunc ante refer suis*. Antony paraded as Hercules (Plutarch, *Vita* iv); he was called the new Dionysus (*ibid.* ix); in Cilicia the people referred to Cleopatra as Aphrodite and to Antony as Dionysus (*ibid.* xxxvi); and at a later time he and the queen were represented together in painting and sculpture as Osiris and Isis (Dio Cass. L 5). Apart from this Oriental nonsense, which was nevertheless offensive enough at Rome, his actual fame was second only to Caesar's from the



time of the battle of Pharsalus to the Ides of March and, from that time until Actium, unrivalled. See Plutarch's tributes, Vita viii and xliii.

Second couplet: cf. Aen. viii 685-688:

hinc ope barbarica variisque Antonius armis,  
victor ab Aurorae populis et litore rubro,  
Aegyptum viresque Orientis et ultima secum  
Bactra vehit, sequiturque (nefas) Aegyptia conjunx.

To this may be added the muster of kings in Plutarch, Vita lxi.

Third couplet: Rome feared Antony at Actium more than she had feared Hannibal at her gates. The report was current that Alexandria would be the capital and Italy be made a present to Cleopatra (Dio Cass. I 4). It was Cleopatra's dearest wish to sit in judgment on the Capitol (ibid. L 5).

Fourth couplet: This describes the sudden collapse of Antony's campaign and the flight from Actium. Antony thereafter considered himself an exile and pleaded for permission to spend the balance of his life as a private citizen at Athens (Plutarch, Vita lxxii).

Last couplet: Most difficult of interpretation but, once the sense is perceived, truly Vergilian. *mortalia* = *ea quae mortalibus fato debentur*; cf. Aen. i 462 *mentem mortalia tangunt*. *Fallax . . . hora*: Georg. i 426 *numquam te crastina fallit / hora*. *Dedit*, which the editors emend to *adedit*, *premit*, *ferit*, and *terit*, is "customary" perfect and nothing but 'dare' in its commonest sense. Cf. Horace, Odes iii 8 28 *Dona praesentis cape laetus horae*; also ibid. ii 16 31-32 *Et mihi forsitan quod negarit / porriget hora*. The hour is more often the bringer of good gifts, which adds a grimness to the Vergilian passage.

NORMAN W. DE WITT.

## VI.—ΓΥΜΝΟΣ AND NUDUS.

According to our Greek and Latin dictionaries, most of the handbooks on antiquities,<sup>1</sup> and innumerable editors, *γυμνός* and *nudus* "in common language meant 'lightly clad', i. e., 'in the tunic or undergarment only', without the mantle" (L. and S.). The interpretation was originally suggested by the Dutch scholar Gisbert Cuyper in his *Observationes* 1. 7.<sup>2</sup> Adopted at once, and, so far as I know, never questioned since, it has saved modern prudery many a serious shock. For example, how many teachers have been helped over a troublesome spot by having the fair Milesian in *Xen. An.* 1. 10. 3 "lightly clad"!

But in several ways the theory seems improbable. In the first place, the use of the same word to describe one clad in a tunic and one who was completely naked must have been inconvenient for men who spent a considerable part of their time in each condition. They could, of course, make their meaning clear by such a phrase as (*Ps.-Mosch.* 4. 98):

γυμνός ἄτερ χλαίνης τε καὶ εὐμίτροιο χιτῶνος,

but everyday speech will not long tolerate a periphrasis for so familiar an idea. It is furthermore inherently improbable that a man clad in the tunic should commonly be called "naked" in communities where under certain circumstances the tunic was a complete costume. Our suspicions are further strengthened by the fact that *γυμνός* and *nudus* are sometimes used where the contrasting idea is not "fully clad" but "scantily clad"; e. g., *Dem. Meid.* 583; *μικροῦ γυμνὸν ἐν τῷ χιτωνίσκῳ*, *Herond.* 5. 46: *δώσεις τι . . . ῥάκος . . . ὥς μὴ δι' ἀγορῆς γυμνὸς ὦν θεωρῆται*, *Amm. Marc.* 31. 16. 6: *nudus omnia praeter pubem*. Oddly enough the first of these and several similar passages have been cited as evidence that *γυμνός* may mean "scantily clad". Thus *Hippolochus ap. Ath.* 129 A, which clearly involves a contrast

<sup>1</sup> Becker's *Gallus* and Johnston's *The Private Life of the Romans* are among the exceptions.

<sup>2</sup> The book is inaccessible to me. It is referred to by numerous editors as authority for the interpretation which we are discussing.

between γυμνός and ἔχων χιτῶνα, has nevertheless misled some on account of the hyperbolic use of γυμνός (cf. below). The passage runs: . . . σαμβυκίστριαί τινες Ῥόδιαί, ἐμοὶ μὲν γυμναὶ δοκῶ, πλὴν ἐλεγόν τινες αὐτὰς ἔχειν χιτῶνας . . .

It has therefore seemed worth while to examine the usage of the two words as far as it can be traced with the help of available indexes and lexicons. Probably some passages which have been interpreted according to Cuypert's theory have been overlooked, but it is hoped that enough material is presented below to form a basis for the argument.

It will be convenient to treat the Greek and the Latin word together, and there seems to be no objection to doing so since I can detect no difference in their meaning, and their equivalence is assumed by the current theory also.

In addition to their literal meaning and the obvious metaphorical uses, γυμνός and nudus often occur in the familiar military sense "without protective armor". They also refer to partial nudity when the limitation is stated, as in Plat. Legg. II. 925 A: γυμνὰς δὲ ὀμφαλοῦ μέχρι, or Verg. Aen. I. 320: nuda genu.

Somewhat nearer to Cuypert's interpretation is the hyperbolic use analogous to the modern woman's frequent remark that she "hasn't a stitch to wear", or the complaints of certain critics about "nudity on the stage". Thus, according to Pollux 6. 197, some people called a beggar γυμνός, and Xenophon, Hell. 2. I. 1, says that in the winter 406-405 the soldiers of Eteonicus γυμνοὶ τε ἦσαν καὶ ἀνυπόδητοι. Aristophanes, Eccl. 409, says that a certain poverty-stricken fellow addressed the ecclesia

γυμνός, ὥς ἐδόκει τοῖς πλείοσιν.  
αὐτός γε μέντοφασκεν ἱμάτιον ἔχειν.

Similarly Cicero, Phil. 2. 86, 3. 12, 13. 31, taunts Antony with having been nudus at the time when he addressed the people in the costume of the *luperci*. An Ar. Lys. 151, Lysistrata says to the women:

εἰ γὰρ καθήμεθ' ἐνδον ἐντετριμμέναι  
κἂν τοῖς χιτωνίοισι τοῖς ἀμοργίνοις  
γυμναὶ παρίοιμεν, δέλτα παρατετιλμέναι,  
στίβουσιν δ' ἄνδρες . . .

where γυμναὶ is added παρὰ προσδοκίαν to indicate that χιτῶνια ἀμόρ-γυνα are scarcely clothes at all. Similar passages are Philem. 4. 59 Mein., Eubul. 3. 237 = 246 Mein., Publilius Syrus (?) ap. Petron. 56, N. T. I Cor. 4. 11, Lucan 6. 794 (cf. Hor. A. P. 50).

There remain a number of passages where modern feeling would lead us to expect the person mentioned to wear more or less clothing. But that the ancients felt far otherwise about such matters is well known (cf. especially Plat. Rep. 5. 452 C).<sup>1</sup> Complete nudity was common with them under circumstances where it is quite unknown in the modern world. The evidence, both literary and archeological, is so abundant and so familiar that it need not be cited here.

Greek and Roman workmen sometimes wore the tunic or one of its variations, as the *ἐξωμίς*, and sometimes they went naked. It was quite out of the question to wear the *ιμάτιον* or the *toga* while at work, and therefore to understand *γυμνός* or *nudus* as informing us that a laborer is not wearing a mantle is like saying that a modern farmer does not wear his dress coat while following the plow. Hesiod's famous injunction (Op. 391):

γυμνὸν σπείρειν, γυμνὸν δὲ βοῶτεϊν,  
γυμνὸν δ' ἁμάειν, εἰ χ' ὥρια πάντ' ἐθέλησθα  
ἔργα κομίζεσθαι Δημήτερος,

must be accepted at its face value, and so must Vergil's repetition of it (Georg. 1. 299):

Nudus ara, sere nudus.

Hesiod was, no doubt, simply reporting a rustic proverb. Its origin may possibly be suggested by a fertility charm which is recorded in the Geoponica 2. 42. 3: *παρθένος ὥραν ἔχουσα γάμου, ἀνυπόδετος, γυμνή, μηδὲν καθόλου περικειμένη, λελυμένη τὰς τρίχας . . . περιελθέτω τὸ χωρίον*. The allusion to Hesiod's injunction in Ar. Lys. 1173 requires the literal meaning of *γυμνός*.

There is no reason to doubt that Cincinnatus was naked at his plow when the *viator* brought word of his appointment as dictator (Plin. 18. 20, Aur. Vict. Viri Illustr. 17). Plutarch's remark about Cato the elder really admits of only one interpretation (Cat. Mai. 3): . . . *ἂν μὲν ἢ χειμῶν ἐξωμίδα λαβὼν, θέρους δὲ γυμνὸς ἐργασάμενος μετὰ τῶν οἰκετῶν*: for *ἐξωμίς* must be a translation of Latin *tunica*. With this compare Plat. Rep. 2. 372 A.

The situation is similar in N. T. Jno. 21. 7, where we are told that Simon Peter was *γυμνός* while fishing on the Sea of Tiberias. That the word here has its ordinary meaning is clearly shown by Nonnus' paraphrase of the passage (21. 37-44).

<sup>1</sup> Roman feeling on this subject was not quite the same as that of the Greeks (cf. Cic. Tusc. 4. 70). It is certain, however, that nakedness among the Romans was much more common than among us.

The practice of stripping for exercise is so well known that *γυμνός* and *nudus* in this context have rarely been misinterpreted.<sup>1</sup> There has been some hesitancy to believe that the gymnastic exercises of the Spartan girls involved complete nudity; but Becker-Göll, Charikles 225-230, show that at any rate such was the opinion of the authors upon whom our knowledge of the matter depends. This is proved in any case by the word *ἀπόδυσις* in Plut. Lyc. 15, but *γυμνός* and *nudus*, often used in this connection, are really no less explicit.

Here may be placed the curious passage in Xen. An. 4. 4. 12, where the soldiers who have bivouacked in the snow hesitate to get up. *ἐπεὶ δὲ Ξενοφῶν ἐτόλμησε γυμνὸς ἀναστὰς σχίζειν ξύλα, τάχ' ἀναστὰς τις καὶ ἄλλος ἐκείνου ἀφελόμενος ἔσχιζεν.* Xenophon's purpose, both in the deed and in the telling of it, was to exhibit his hardihood.

Equally well understood are the numerous references to naked dancers. One passage alone requires comment. The epitome of Athenaeus (20 F) records that after the battle of Salamis the youthful Sophocles *περὶ τρόπαιον γυμνὸς ἀληλιμμένος ἐχόρευσε μετὰ λύρας· οἱ δὲ ἐν ἱματίῳ φασί.* Instead of *ἱματίῳ* equally good manuscript authority gives *ἱματίοις*, which would make it quite necessary to interpret *γυμνός* literally. Even with the common reading there is no reason to do otherwise.

No one doubts that Greek boys often wore no clothes, but in one passage the editors have tried to dress them. In Ar. Nub. 963 ff. *Δίκαιος Λόγος* contrasts the old education with the new:

(987 ff.) *πρῶτον μὲν ἔδει παιδὸς φωνὴν γρύξαντος μὴδὲν ἀκοῦσαι·  
εἶτα βαδίζειν ἐν ταῖσιν ὁδοῖς εὐτάκτως εἰς κιθαριστοῦ  
τοὺς κωμήτας γυμνοὺς ἀθρόους, καὶ κριμνώδη κατανίφοι.  
σὺ δὲ τοὺς νῦν εὐθὺς ἐν ἱματίοις διδάσκεις ἐντετυλίχθαι.  
ὥστε μ' ἀπάγχεσθ' ὅταν ὀρχεισθαι Παναθηναίοις δέον αὐτοὺς  
τὴν ἀσπίδα τῆς κωλῆς προέχων ἀμελῇ τῆς Τριτογενείας.*

Clearly the bad habit of wearing clothes had made the youngsters ridiculously self-conscious.

We need waste no words on the good Samaritan (Koch Index s. v. *nudus*) who has taken pity on the *Gratia nuda* with her *nudis sororibus* in Hor. Od. 4. 7. 6 and 3. 19. 17.

Plato, Legg. 12. 954 A, tells us that if a man wished to search his neighbor's house for stolen property he must do so *γυμνὸς ἢ*

<sup>1</sup> In Herodian 1. 15. 15, *γυμνός* may mean either "without armor" or "naked". Immisch, Index s. v., translates "cum veste aliqua".



χιτωνίσκον ἔχων ἄζωστος. Jowett is certainly correct in translating "naked or having only a short tunic and no upper girdle" There is no reason for Hermann's deletion of ἦ.

There is an allusion to the custom in Ar. Nub. 497 ff.:

Σω. ἴθι νυν, κατάθου θοίμάτιον. Στρ. ἡδίκηκά τι;

Σω. οὐκ, ἀλλὰ γυμνοῦς εἰσιέναι νομίζεται.

Στρ. ἀλλ' οὐχὶ φωράσων ἐγωγ' εἰσέρχομαι.

Σω. κατάθου, τί ληρεῖς;

The fact that Strepsiades appears to be γυμνός as soon as he has removed θοίμάτιον may be explained in either one of two ways: perhaps he, like Socrates, was old-fashioned enough to wear no tunic, or perhaps ἱμάτιον is to be understood as equivalent to ἱμάτια. Since the removal of the clothes before entering the φροντιστήριον is part of the initiation it is fair to assume that the novice would be required to strip completely, even if he were going to substitute ceremonial garments, as was done in the ritual at the cave of Trophonius in Lebadea to which Strepsiades presently refers (cf. Paus. 9. 39. 8. Luc. D. Mort. 3. 2).<sup>1</sup>

The ancient authors frequently tell of persons who were forcibly deprived of their clothes by robbers, by mobs, by a victorious enemy, or as the result of a conviction in court. When such persons are referred to as γυμνός or *nudus* it is never necessary and it is sometimes impossible to suppose that they had been allowed to keep their tunics. Typical instances are: Dem. Conon 1259, Polyb. 15. 33. 7-12, Petron. 92, Cic. Verr. 4. 86 f., Liv. 3. 23. 5, Hdn. 2. 13. 17, 19, Xen. An. 1. 10. 3, Plat. Legg. 9. 873 B, 854 D.

γυμνός has a somewhat similar context in Babrius' tale of the one swallow that did not make a summer (131):

Νέος ἐν κύβοισιν οἰσίην ἀναλώσας  
στολὴν ἑαυτῷ κατέλιπεν μίαν μόνην  
χειμῶνος ὄντος. . . .

Then he heard a swallow and

"τί μοι περισσῶν" εἶπε "φαρέων χρεῖη;  
ἰδοὺ χελιδὼν ἦδε· καῦμα σημαίνει".

<sup>1</sup>Of course Strepsiades' fear that he is to experience horrors like those at Lebadea does not imply that he is actually rigged out like the initiates there—ἐσταλμένος ταῖς ὁθόναῖς γελοῖως, in Lucian's phrase. The scholiast on our passage declares that the initiates at Lebadea were γυμνοί, but that is not the only point in which his account is inconsistent with Pausanias and Lucian.

So he staked his στολήν μίαν μούνην and lost. Soon snow began to fall,

γυμνός δ' ἐκεῖνος τῆς θύρης ὑπεκκύνψας  
καὶ τὴν λάλον χελιδόν' αὐ κατοπτεύσας. . . .

In case a man found it suddenly necessary to get rid of all hindrances to the free use of his limbs, either to escape pursuit or for any other purpose, he was said *ρίψαι τὸ ἱμάτιον* (e. g., Lysias 97. 30). Both the phrase itself and the requirements of the situation lead one to think that in such cases a man did not usually stop to rid himself of his tunic also. In two such passages, however, the word *γυμνός* occurs: Plat. Rep. 474 A: καὶ ὅς, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἔφη, τοιοῦτον ἐκβέβληκας ῥῆμά τε καὶ λόγον, ὃν εἰπὼν ἡγοῦ ἐπὶ σὲ πάνυ πολλοὺς τε καὶ οὐ φαύλους νῦν οὕτως οἶον ῥίψαντας τὰ ἱμάτια γυμνοὺς, λαβόντας ὃ τι ἐκάστω παρέτυχεν ὄπλον, θεῖν διατεταμένους ὡς θανμάσια ἐργασομένους. Luc. Hermot. 23: πάντων μάλιστα ἐπὶ τούτῳ σπουδαστέον, τῶν δ' ἄλλων ἀμελητέον, καὶ μήτε πατρίδος τῆς ἐνταῦθα ἐπιλαμβανομένης πολὺν ποιείσθαι τὸν λόγον μήτε παίδων . . . ἀλλὰ . . . ἀποσεισάμενον αὐτοὺς χωρεῖν εὐθὺ τῆς πανευδαίμονος ἐκείνης πόλεως καὶ αὐτὸ ἀπορρίψαντα τὸ ἱμάτιον, εἰ τούτου ἐπειλημμένοι κατερύκοιεν, ἐσσύμενον ἐκείσε· οὐ γὰρ δέος μὴ σέ τις ἀποκλείσῃ καὶ γυμνὸν ἦκοντα. In both cases we have, not an account of an actual occurrence, but an imaginary situation, and the word *γυμνός* is obviously added for the purpose of suggesting greater energy of action. In the passage from Plato, then, we should understand *ἱμάτια* as meaning "clothes", while in Lucian the καί before *γυμνόν* shows that we have a heightening of the idea originally expressed by *ἀπορρίψαντα τὸ ἱμάτιον*.

It is perfectly possible to interpret many of the above passages according to Cuypert's theory; but, since that theory rests upon no ancient authority, it can be established only on the basis of passages where no other interpretation is satisfactory. If there are any such they have not come to my attention.

E. H. STURTEVANT.

BARNARD COLLEGE, NEW YORK.

## REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

**Sex. Propertii Elegiarum Libri IV Recensuit Carolus Hosius In Aedibus B. G. Teubneri Lipsiae MCMXI. Pp. xvi + 190.**

**Catulli, Tibulli, Properti Carmina quae extant Omnia cura Robinson Ellis, Ioannis P. Postgate, Ioannis S. Phillimore, apud P. H. Lee Warner Mediceae Societatis Librarium Londini MDCCCXI. Pp. 319.**

The new Teubner text of Propertius by Professor Hosius is based upon the MSS used by Baehrens (N A F D V) with the addition of Professor Postgate's L. Of N Mr. Hosius says: *codex solus ante tempora litterarum renascentium scriptus interpolationibus humanistarum caret, non mendis: optimus est, non unicus testis memoriae Propertianae.* The readings of this codex (with the exception of purely orthographical variants) are fully recorded in the apparatus. Of the other MSS all readings important for determining the text, and many useful for illustrating relationships, are included; other variants are for the most part omitted. The readings of F, a MS difficult to make out and often incorrectly reported by Baehrens, are here given from a collation made in 1908 by the editor, who has also contributed to the apparatus a number of *testimonia*, chiefly from inscriptions. Professor Hosius has now, in deference to the arguments of Mr. Postgate, given up his former opinion that in Neapolitanus 268 we have a text which may serve to control the readings of the parent of A F from the point (ii. 1.63) where A stops, nor does he show himself more indulgent toward the claims made by Professor Birt and his pupils, Messrs. Koehler and Heukrath, in behalf of the Codex Lusaticus, which those scholars regard as forming with N the proper basis for the text of Propertius. No account is taken of the recently propounded theory of Mr. Richmond, nor of Professor Ullman's still newer article on the Manuscripts of Propertius, which latter paper indeed reached the editor too late to be considered. In a word the new edition of Propertius rests upon the same foundations as those of Messrs. Postgate, Phillimore, and Butler. Mr. Hosius is practically at one too with these gentlemen in the relative estimate he places upon his MSS, and in rejecting the estimate of Baehrens, whose codices D V are now known to be later than A F, and inferior to them.

It would however be a mistake to conclude that the new edition marks no advance upon its predecessors. It is easily, in my opinion, the most useful edition of the text we have yet had, for

the following reasons: (1) The MSS are reported more carefully than ever before, and with the possible exception of Baehrens' inaccurate apparatus, more fully. (2) The text adheres rather closely to the MS tradition, in many places even where it is not certain that it is true. The preface warns us of this policy: *Quid poetae licuerit vel quid libuerit, qui diiudicare vult, quaestionem adit magnae aleae, quam aliter alius arbiter solvat. Itaque in textu restituendo, quod explicari posse ullo modo putavi, retinui verius tamen scriptori absurda quoque et absona vindicare.* This principle, if wisely enforced (and the editor has acquitted himself of his extremely difficult task with nice discrimination), is sure to provide a text which will afford to other students of Propertius a sound and convenient basis for their work. It is open to one objection only, viz., that in certain places where the editor finds the tradition explicable his readers may not agree with him. But this objection is largely obviated by (3) the inclusion in the very compactly printed yet liberal apparatus of a large number of conjectures ranging from unknown humanists whose emendations are preserved in the interpolated MSS down to our own day. It is impossible to speak too highly of this last feature of Mr. Hosius' work. Of the 7300 verbal emendations, 1000 transpositions (not including those of the arch-transposer Scaliger), 85 indications of lacunae, and 450 suspected verses, (not to speak of the wholesale attacks on Book IV by Carutti and Heimreich), which the editor has gathered together in the course of his wide reading in the literature of his subject, he has laboriously sifted out for printing those which seem to him worth preserving. The result is an apparatus which provides in most instances a sufficient equipment for the intelligent criticism of this most perplexing of Latin classics, while, on the other hand, one may read or consult the text itself with a reasonable assurance that the tradition has never been wantonly departed from. Finally (4) should be mentioned the valuable set of indices, (a) *Initia Carminum*, (b) *Index nominum*, (c) *Index metricus et prosodiacus*, (d) *Index grammaticus*. The latter two contain truly *multum in parvo*.

The value of the new Teubner text lies chiefly, it is true, in the sanity and industry with which its editor has employed the materials already, in diverse forms, in the hands of scholars. He has, however, contributed to the apparatus about a score of new conjectures, though I believe he has nowhere admitted a guess of his own to a place in the text. In general this practice is justified by the nature of the proposed alterations which though often interesting are seldom convincing. The principle is perhaps applied a bit too rigorously at ii. 2.11, where Professor Butler's *Mercurio et sacris* is printed in the text, although the note runs: *malim ut*. As *et* is itself a mere conjecture it would seem to be the editor's duty to replace it by his own, since, as he says, he prefers it to the other.

At i. 11. 18 Sed quod in hac omnis parte veretur amor<sup>1</sup> veretur is Lachmann's, and Mr. Hosius suggests *tenetur*. Perhaps we should keep O's *timetur*, understanding *omnis amor* as *omnis amator*, or literally "every love," i. e. every love which you inspire. For *in hac parte* "in this region" (Baiae) cf. Cic. At. viii. 3. 6. At i. 15. 6 Et longa faciem quaerere desidia, Mr. Hosius proposes to read *fucum* for *faciem*. But cf. Ov. A. A. iii. 105 *cura dabit faciem*, and *Med. Fac.* 1 *Discite quae faciem commendet cura, puellae*. At i. 15. 29 Multa prius vasto labentur flumina ponto the editor suggests *verso-fonte*. The place is troublesome, but the MSS are very likely right, *vasto ponto* being ablative. i. 17. 3 Nec mihi Cassiope solito visura carinam, the editor's *Cassiope est laeto* is not remote from the letters, but the sense is scarcely improvement enough to satisfy those who believe the MSS corrupt. Mr. Phillimore's translation, "I am no practised traveler, but Cassiope must now behold my bark," rests upon a Propertian usage (*nec mihi solito=et mihi insolito*, cf. Postgate, Selections, CXIX), and the reading, thus explained, may possibly be sound. At i. 17. 14 Primus et invito gurgite fecit iter, the note reads: *malim insueta*. But *invito* is quite in the spirit of the context, and cf. Horace's *nequiquam deus abscidit*, and the personification of winds and waves in iii. 7. At i. 18. 27 Pro quo divini fontes et frigida rupes, the editor suggests *ieiuni montes*, comparing Cic. *Verr.* iii. 37. 84, and Verg. *G.* ii. 212. This makes good sense, but Mr. Postgate's *mi nudi*, and Mr. Enk's *mi duri* are perhaps better, as supplying the dative. ii. 1. 21 Nec veteres Thebas nec Pergama, nomen Homeri. The conjecture *carmen Homeri* would be a good one if the text of O were not unexceptionable. ii. 3. 22 Carmina, quae quivis non putat aequa suis. Here Mr. Hosius queries *an—que Aonidis* (Aonies)?—a not very probable conjecture, from the standpoint of the letters. ii. 19. 19 Incipiam captare feras et reddere pinu Cornua. Here it is proposed to read *tendere panda*, but the need of emendation is to my mind more than doubtful. At ii. 29. 5, Quorum alii faculas, alii retinere sagittas, Pars etiam visa est vincla parare mihi, *strinxere*, which Mr. Hosius suggests, gives a good meaning, but the reference to ii. 19. 24 *stricto calamo* is not particularly in point, for *calamo* there means "lime-rod" not "arrow" (C. P. ii., 1907, p. 213). iii. 1. 27 Idaeum Simoenta, Iovis cunabula parvi. Here the editor's *Phrygis* does indeed give a better sense than *Iovis*, but not quite good enough, for we are still left with only one river, and *flumina* vs. 26 shows we need two. Moreover we find *Iovis* in all the MSS, whereas *cunabula parvi* is omitted by N. Wolff's *cum prole Scamandro* remains the most satisfactory guess yet made. iii. 4. 6 Adsuescent Latio Partha tropaea Iovi. The text seems to me sound. The *accident* of Fonteinius offers a possible meaning, but is unneces-

<sup>1</sup> I print first the text as the editor himself gives it.



sary. Mr. Hosius' *Ac cedent* is not only unnecessary, but intrinsically unlikely. How are Parthian *trophies* to yield to Jove? At iii. 6. 28, Et lecta exsectis anguibus ossa trahunt, Lachmann proposed *ex structis* (here incorrectly reported as *exstructis*) *ignibus*, and Mr. Hosius suggests *extinctis*. But *anguibus* seems not likely to be wrong here.

At iii. 11. 5, Venturam melius praesagit navita mortem, / Vulneribus didicit miles habere metum, Mr. Hosius quotes Markland's *vetulus*, and Lachmann's *pavidus*, and observes *praeplacere* tremulus. Of the three conjectures *tremulus* is obviously the best, but it does not meet the exigencies of the line. Why should a sailor foresee death better than, say, a soldier? Does not the pentameter show that such was not the poet's meaning? Again, why is the comparison (*melius praesagit*) left half-expressed? Finally, why is there no mention, in the hexameter, of storms or winds, to offset *vulneribus* in the short line? This last difficulty Mr. Postgate sought to remove by writing *Ventorum-motum*. (The conjecture was published in J. P. IX p. 68: Mr. Hosius ascribes it to Owen). But the second objection still remains. We might, to be sure, resort to contamination, and combine Mr. Postgate's conjecture with that of Mr. Hosius, reading *Ventorum tremulus praesagit navita motum*, but, after all, it is not enough to make the *frightened* sailor foresee the coming storm. Rather we should expect an *experienced* sailor, taught by a sailor's trials, as in the next line we have an experienced soldier taught by a soldier's woes,—both verses leading naturally up to vs. 8 Tu nunc *exemplo disce* timere (i. e. in love) *meo*. It was presumably this line of reasoning which led Mr. Postgate later to propose *Naufrage iam melius praesagis* navita mortem, but the departure from the MSS is a considerable one. Possibly Propertius wrote *Ventis iam monitus praesagit navita mortem*. I feel almost certain we must have *ventis* at least. Cf. ii. 1. 43 Navita de ventis, de tauris narrat arator, / Et numerat miles vulnera, pastor ovis. Also ii. 27. 11 sq. Solus amans novit quando periturus et a qua / Morte, neque hic *Boreae flabra* neque arma timet. Ovid *Am.* ii. 11 is full of Propertian echoes and at vs. 25 he has navita sollicitus cum ventos horret iniquos, / et prope tam letum quam prope cernit aquam, an expansion after Ovid's fashion of the one line in his model. Possibly we should read therefore *Ventis sollicitus praesagit navita mortem*. This would supply the element of *fear* found in vss. 6 and 8, but is not so near the letters.

iii. 17. 6 Tu vitium ex animo dilue, Bacche, meo. The use of *vitium* is defended by ii. 1.65 Hoc si quis vitium poterit mihi demere (cf. also ii. 22. 17 sq.). Mr. Hosius' *vinculum* is therefore superfluous. At iv. 1. 97 Fatales pueri, duo funera matris avarae! the text is equally unimpeachable. To alter *avarae*, as our editor proposes, to *amara* is to ignore the close association of war and wealth which appears so often in Propertius, as e. g. at iii. 5. 1-6,

and at iii. 12. 5 sq. we have the adjective with precisely the same implications as in the passage under discussion—*Si fas est, omnes pariter pereatis avari, / et quisquis fido praetulit arma toro!* The mother sends her sons to war that their booty may enrich her, and we can ill spare *avarae* for a feeble stop-gap like *amara*. At iv. 4. 85 *Omnia praebebant somnos*, I can see no objection to *Omnia* "all the circumstances." If any change were necessary I should prefer Luetjohann's *carpebant* to Mr. Hosius' *Otia*. iv. 6. 25 *Tandem aciem geminos Nereus lunarat in arcus*. Here *Tandem* seems to me so appropriate that I am at a loss to conceive why it should ever have occurred to Mr. Hosius to suggest *Tantam*. At iv. 11. 72 *Laudat ubi emeritum libera fama rogam* we have in the proposal to substitute *emeritam* for *emeritum* what I regard as the best of our editor's emendations and one which might almost, even without violating his own strict canons, have been received into the text. It is a much better conjecture than the *emeritum torum* of Heinsius.

It might be inferred from the rigor with which Mr. Hosius has treated his own conjectures that his text would prove to be slavishly faithful to the MSS. Such is by no means the case. There are indeed many places usually regarded as corrupt where the Teubner edition retains the tradition. Thus we read *cogis* at ii. 1. 5; *De me, mi certe poteris formosa videri*, at ii. 18. 29; *Mansisti stabulis abdita pasta tuis!* at ii. 32. 12, where Palmer's *mandisti et arbuta* is probably right. At ii. 34. 31, *Tu satius memorem Musis imitere Philitam, memorem* is pretty surely wrong. It would be easy to multiply examples, but we must remember the editor's policy—to emend only when the words can in no way be explained without absurdity or inconsistency. As a matter of fact conjectures find their way into the text far oftener than is the case in Mr. Phillimore's Oxford text (1901, second edition 1907), and the Teubner text is much more readable, in consequence. So at i. 8. 19 *Utere felici praevecta Ceraunia remo (Ut te N A F V<sub>3</sub>)*; ii. 18. 9 *Illum saepe suis decedens fovit in ulnis (undis O)*; ii. 32. 23 *Nuper enim de te nostras pervenit ad aures / Rumor (pervenit, may not be right, but me laedit O seems pretty certainly wrong)*. So at iii. 5. 14 Hosius adopts the certain correction of Schrader *at inferna rate* for O's *ad infernas rates*. Again at iii. 11. 31 *Coniugii obsceni pretium Romana poposcit / Moenia, Passerat's* certain correction of O's *coniugis* is adopted. The poem is a tirade against Cleopatra and contains no direct reference to Antony, the *coniugis* of O. (For vs. 56 see below). Sometimes the editor seems to have gone farther than his plan warrants. At iii. 5. 1 sq. *Pacis Amor deus est, pacem veneramur amantes: / Sat mihi cum domina praelia dura mea, sat* is an injudicious emendation by Livineius of O's perfectly sound *stant*. *Propertius* means that Love is the god of peace, in the sense of peace among nations; that he himself does, to be sure, wage wars with

his mistress, but that these wars are not (like real wars) prompted by greed of gain (See Otto, *Hermes* xxiii., p. 40). Again, at ii. 29b. 1 sq. *Mane erat, et volui, si sola quiesceret illa, / Visere: et* in lecto Cynthia sola fuit, the *et* of O is distinctly superior to *et s*, for the poet's thought is "but (despite my suspicions) she *was* alone." In these and some other places the Oxford text preserves the tradition where the Teubner editor has needlessly forsaken it.

In dealing with the vexatious problem of misplaced lines Mr. Hosius has adopted the best possible plan: he has noted in his apparatus a large number of proposed transpositions, but has admitted scarcely any to his text. In i. 15 verses 17-20 have been printed before vs. 15, with Markland, and iv. 9. 73 sq. have been placed before 71, with Schneidewin. That these two transpositions are any more certain than e. g. that of iii. 20. 11 sq. after 13 sq., proposed by Scaliger, or for that matter than a dozen others, or a score of others, can hardly be maintained. But Mr. Hosius has deserved so well of the republic for restricting himself to two transpositions that it would be ungrateful to quarrel with his choice were it even less compelling than it is. I would not be understood to think that the text is free from dislocations. No one who has read Propertius attentively can doubt that there are many places where an alteration in the order of the verses would add clearness to the thought; but the very fact that different scholars can propose such widely different arrangements of the same piece, e. g. iii. 7, shows how impossible it must be to attain certain results by transposition. It must be admitted that the distichal structure of elegy was tolerant of, if not conducive to, a looseness of connection, a disjunctiveness in the presentation of ideas, which modern criticism is quite powerless to control. An editor is bound therefore to concede to his readers the right to exercise their own judgment upon any proposed transposition, and should not—at least in such an edition as this—obtrude his own convictions upon others. The apparatus is his proper place for presenting such suggestions for re-ordering the run of the verses as he may deem worthy of attention. From this point on each reader must be his own editor.

No lines are obelized in the Teubner text, but at four places lacunae are indicated. These are at ii. 9. 48, ii. 22. 42, ii. 30. 12, and iii. 22. 36. This last difficulty is removed by Mr. Phillimore in his new Riccardi text by the transposition of vs. 37 sq. to follow vs. 10. We thus get a verb (*aspicias* in vs. 7) to govern *cruces* (vs. 37), and Sinis fits in better with Atlas, Phorcys, Geryon, and Antaeus than with the stories of unnatural crime—Andromeda, Thyestes, Meleager, Pentheus, Iphigenia—in the latter part of the poem. As the two books appeared at about the same time this clever transposition is not mentioned in the Teubner apparatus.

In the re-division of poems Mr. Hosius has proceeded a little more boldly than in the matter of transpositions. i. 8 is printed as

one poem, but with a line and space after vs. 26. The meaning of this is not clear to me. ii. 13 should, I think, be divided to make a new poem begin at vs. 17 *Quandocumque igitur*, and the new text recognizes this conjecture so far as to provide a new line-numbering (along with the traditional numbering) from this point on. (The Riccardi text frankly divides the poem). iii. 1 is made to include the first distich of iii. 2 *Carminis interea*—an improbable division, since vss. 35–38 form a rather striking close, and *Carminis interea*, etc., an effective opening. Conversely ii. 3 loses its last ten verses to ii. 4. A new poem is made to commence at ii. 26. 21 *Nunc admirentur*. ii. 28 is divided into the usual three parts, and ii. 29 is divided after vs. 22.

In several words the spelling of the Teubner edition shows a greater fidelity to the codices than its predecessors have shown. We now have *Philitae* and *Philitea*, *Xersis*, *Perithoum*, *praelia*, *pulcra*, *subponere*, *immortalis*, *haut*, etc. The capitalization of *Sopor*, i. 3. 45, is a good idea, and I like too *amoris* with a small initial at ii. 13. 36 *Unius hic quondam servus amoris erat*.

I note the following errors, in addition to those corrected by the editor. In the text: i. 15. 32 *Sis*, *quodcumque voles*, (the first comma should be omitted—or does the editor take *Sis* with *non aliena tamen*? i. 18. 11 *Sic modo te referas levis*, ut non altera nostro (comma omitted after *referas*); ii. 29. 39 comma omitted after *Dixit* (cf. vs. 10); III, 18. 27 comma omitted after *Achillen*; iv. 4. 67 comma omitted after *Dixit*, *ibid.* 91 comma omitted after *Dixit*; IV. 9. 42 [*Accipite: Haec fesso vix mihi terra patet.*] Here *O* reads *accipit*, and as the line is bracketed, as a duplication of vs. 66, there is no point in emending it. At IV. 11. 35 the German type-setter has given us *Jungor* for *Iungor*. In the apparatus: on p. 15, VII should be XII; II. 10. 23 *in arcem* belongs to Paulmier, not to Birt; ii 19. 32 *mi* belongs to Paley, not to Postgate; ii 22. 44 *Gwynu* should be *Gwynn*; ii 33. 12. *Mandisti-arbuta* should be *Mandisti et —arbuta*; iii 6. 28, *exstructis* should be *ex structis*. *Index carminum* p. 162 *Pacis Amor* is iii. 5, not ii. 5. *Index nominum* p. 173 *Philitaea* should be *Philitea*.

Professor Phillimore's new text of Propertius appears in an édition de luxe of the triumvirate of amatory poets,<sup>1</sup> and in view of the price of the volume, a guinea, will be likely to adorn the libraries of connoisseurs in book-making oftener than the study-tables of classical students. It is unfortunate that this should be so, for the new Propertius is a very interesting one, fairly bristling with new emendations, of which some have recently been published in the *Classical Review* (xxiv, 1910, p. 213 sqq., xxv, 1911, p. 12 sq., p. 135 sqq.), and *Classical Philology* (iv, 1909, p. 315 sqq.), some have only seen the light in the foot-notes

<sup>1</sup> I have dealt in this review only with the edition of Propertius. The texts of Catullus and Tibullus are reprinted with relatively few changes from the Oxford texts by the same editors.



to the editor's translation of Propertius (Oxford, 1906), and still others appear here for the first time. The book is printed upon a beautiful heavy paper from types especially designed for the Medicean Society and with initials in blue. The letters have an almost monumental look and are very handsome, but the effect of the page is marred by the unfortunate character of the small *a*, which has a squat appearance due to the loop being too flat and set too low. The demi-binding in boards and canvas back is obviously intended only to protect the book from injury until it can be worthily bound in leather to suit the taste of its purchaser. It will then be a magnificent volume and should last for a millennium or two. But it is too bulky and heavy and the type is too large and bold for one to adopt the book as an intimate companion, and one is reminded of Lamb's feeling that magnificence of dress is out of place in a great classic.

The most striking feature of the editor's work is the way in which he has broken up his text into sections, or paragraphs, of from two to thirty odd lines. In an elegist whose abrupt transitions make it so hard to follow the development of his thoughts, and who is so prone to allow his sentence to overflow the limits of the distich, a new device for punctuating, such as we have here, is certainly worth considering. In its favor is the undoubted help it affords the reader in following the succession of the poet's ideas, as they are understood by the editor. It is also in its favor that it often serves to call the reader's attention to a symmetry of structure which else might easily pass unnoticed. Thus at i. 5 *Invide, tu tandem* Mr. Phillimore's divisions show the poem to consist of five 6-line sections plus one concluding distich. Again, ii. 12 *Quicumque ille fuit* divides quite naturally into six 4-line sections. On the other hand readers will often differ with the editor respecting the proper grouping of the distichs in this or that poem. Thus at iv. 11 *Desine, Paulle, meum*, Mr. Phillimore divides into seven 14-line sections, plus a concluding one of 4 lines. Here my own feeling would be for beginning the fourth paragraph at 45, *nec mea mutata est aetas*, rather than at 43, *non fuit exuviis*, and that 71 sq., *haec est feminei merces* belong by themselves (as Mr. Phillimore puts them in his translation), or with the preceding group, not with the following one, as they are here given. Again, iii. 20 *Credis cum iam posse*, is here printed as five 6-line sections. But however we may regard Scaliger's proposed transposition of 11 sq. and 13 sq., beginning a new poem with 13, I for one have no doubt that these two distichs belong together. Now it would be unfair to Mr. Phillimore to assume that a disposition to discover symmetry in his author had led him to disregard certain indications of groupings and to over-emphasize others, yet it looks here and there, as though he had in truth conceived of his sections as strophes, rather than as mere paragraphs, and as such not to be strictly identified with sense units. The attitude would, I think, be mistaken. It is no doubt



interesting to find that the sense often falls into metrically equivalent divisions, but the indication of such divisions, to be worth anything, must be based solely on the meaning. So far as this principle has been followed the results are bound to be of real assistance to the reader, especially the occasional reader, for whom such a book seems intended.

Another thing that must be borne in mind in criticising this book is that owing to the circumstance of its being without preface, apparatus, or any kind of notes, the editor may very properly go to greater lengths in correcting his text than would be advisable in a critical edition. It is of little use to the amateur reader to have before him the very words of the tradition, when they are unintelligible. Mr. Phillimore has accordingly admitted many uncertain conjectures in preference to printing the corruptions of the MSS. In fact one is surprised that the process once begun has not been carried out more evenly, for there still remain a number of readings which most scholars regard as indefensible. So at i. 8. 19 ut te, felici praevecta Ceraunia remo, where D V's *utere* is now printed even by so conservative a critic as Mr. Hosius; ii. 23. 14, where N's interrogation point is kept, to the detriment of the sense; ii. 25. 11sq. at, vos qui officia in multis revocatis amores, / quantum sic cruciat lumina nostra dolor! where the *vestra* of D V seems required; iii. 12. 17sq. quid faciet nullo munita puella timore, cum sit luxuriae Roma magistra tuae? Here *suae* of the Itali seems clearly right. At ii. 23. 23sq. libertas quoniam nulli iam restat amanti: nullus liber erit, si quis amare volet, the text is certainly unsound as it stands, and I think Mr. Phillimore might have done worse than to accept my transposition of *nullus* and *si quis* (C. P. ii, 1907, p. 215). ii. 13. 11sq. me iuvet in gremio doctae legisse puellae, / auribus et pueris scripta probasse mea. Here O's *pueris* is possibly intelligible if we construe "and win through their ears the approval of boys for my songs", but that *puris* (D) is more suitable is shown by 13sq. haec ubi contigerint, populi confusa valeto / fabula: nam *domina iudice* tutus ero.

To scholars the chief interest in the edition will be found to consist in the numerous new conjectures, many of which are very clever and ingenious. At i. 20. 15sq. the vulgate runs quae miser ignotis error perpressus in oris / Herculis indomito flevrat Ascanio. Mr. Phillimore proposes quas (i. e. *Nympharum rapinas* vs. 11) miser ignotis erro perpressus in oris / Herculis, etc., thus getting rid of *error Herculis* = *errans Hercules*, and transferring the weeping role to Hylas. Mr. Enk in his *Commentarius Criticus* is disposed to deride this suggestion (which has been printed in C. R. xxiv, 1910, p. 213). He asks Quis umquam poeta elegiacus Hylan Herculis erroneum nominare ausus est? Quasi cum Plauto alioque comico nobis res esset! Et omnino absurdum est Hylan Herculis erroneum vocare, quia semel in sua vita erraverit. These criticisms are trivial. There are abundant

signs in Propertius of a humor, and a homeliness of diction too, not unlike those of Plautus himself. A more serious objection to my mind is this, that for the comparison. Hercules : Hylas = Gallus : x, Hercules and not Hylas should be the one to weep. Nor can I see any impropriety in making the hero shed tears of grief for the loss of the boy. Tears were not regarded as unmanly by the ancients. i. 16. 19sq. (the poet addresses the door) *cur numquam reserata meos admittis amores, nescia furtivas redere mota vices*. The MSS give *preces*, which I think can be satisfactorily explained (C. P. ii., p. 210). In any case I doubt the admissibility of *vices*, for the line would then mean "Thou that knowest not how, being moved, to move me stealthily in return." i. 21. 9sq. *et quaecumque super dispersa invenerit ossa / montibus Etruscis nesciat esse mea (haec sciat O)*. If Gallus had wished the story of his death to be kept from anybody he had only to let his terror-stricken comrade pass unchallenged. The meaning cannot be that Gallus stopped his friend and revealed to him his plight merely that he might charge him not to inform the *soror*. I should therefore prefer to keep *haec sciat*, and in 5sq. to read, with Mr. Postgate, *sic te servato possint gaudere parentes / ut soror acta tuis sentiet e lacrimis*, etc. ii. 10. 23sq. *sic nos nunc, inopes laudis, poscente Camena, / pauperibus sacris vilia tura damus*. Here O has *conscendere carmen*, a reading which with Mr. Mattingly (C. R. xxvi., 1912, p. 49) I believe to be sound. At all events *conscendere* should not be given up, as the context defends it. Those who find *carmen* impossible may follow Mr. Hosius in adopting the clever emendation *culmens*. At ii. 12. 18 *quod superest, alio tramite pelle sitim*, one would hardly recognize our old friend *si puer est alio traice puella tuo (O)*. At ii. 13a. 45 sqq. the new edition presents *nam quo tam dubiae servetur spiritus horae? / Nestor testis eris, post tria saecula cinis: / qui si longa suae minuisset fata senectae / saucius Iliacis miles in aggeribus, / non ante Antilochi vidisset corpus humari, / diceret aut 'O mors cur mihi sera venis?'* The passage has given much trouble but I believe it to be sound except for the probably corrupt *Gallicus* which Mr. Phillimore has replaced with *saucius*. I should read with O and punctuate thus—*nam quo tam dubiae servetur spiritus horae? / Nestoris est visus post tria saecula cinis: / quis tam longaevae minuisset fata senectae / † Gallicus † Iliacis miles in aggeribus? / non ille Antilochi vidisset corpus humari, / diceret aut 'O mors, cur mihi sera venis?'* "What Gallic(?) soldier on Ilium's ramparts would have minished the doom of so great eld? He would not (in that case) have seen the body of Antilochus buried, nor have cried, 'O death why comest thou to me too late?'" We may contrast Vergil Aen. ii. 6 sqq. *quis talia fando / Myrmidonum Dolopumve aut duri miles Ulixi / temperet a lacrimis?* Propertius means that no Trojan would have killed Nestor, for to have done so would have been to spare him the greater punishment of old age. ii. 16. 27sq.

barbarus excussis agitat vestigia limbis— / et subito felix nunc mea regna tenet ! This conjecture seems to me very good. Certainly no satisfactory solution of the difficulty had yet been offered, and I do not see how Mr. Hosius can retain *lumbis*, the reading of O. Another good conjecture is given at ii. 25. 17sq. at nullo teritur dominae *sub lite*, *memor* qui restat et immerita substinat aure minas (dominae teritur *sublimine* (or *sub lumine*) amor *qui* O). The passage is discussed by Mr. Phillimore in C. R. xxv., 1911, p. 12, and *memor* in the sense of 'true', 'faithful' is defended by the citation of Andria 281.

Less happy is the attempt to heal the sore in ii. 27. 7sq. rursum et obiectum fletur (*fletus* N, *flemus* O, *fletis* s, *fles* tu Housman) caput esse tumultu / cum Mavors dubias miscet utrimque manus ; / praeterea domibus flammam *metuisque* (Muller's conjecture for *domibusque* O) ruinas, / neu subeant labris pocula nigra tuis. My objection to *fletur*, which is easily derived from N, and so far plausible, is that we are still left with an ill-motivated second *singular* (*metuisque* and *tuis*), after the second *plural* of vss. 1-4. May I venture to refer to a suggestion I recently made (*Stanford University Publications, Matzke Memorial Volume*, p. 101) to adopt *fletis* s in vs. 7, and in vs. 10 read *vestris*—*labris*, for O's *labris*—*tuis*? ii. 34. 55sq. aspice me, cui parva domi fortuna relicta est / nullus et antiquo Marte triumphus avi, / ut regnem mixtas inter conviva puellas. / hoc ego, quo tibi nunc elevor ingenio ! By thus making a new sentence of vs. 58 Mr. Phillimore adds force to the passage and gives *ego* a natural position. With *ego* we must understand something like *facere possum*. The effect is something like that at iii. 24. 11sq., where the editor does me the honor of printing my *hoc ego* ! non ferro non igne coactus, et ipsa / naufragus Aegaea—vera fatebor—*aqua* !

At iii. 1. 23sq. I am glad to see that both the Teubner and the Riccardi texts give N's *Famae*, rather than O's *Omnia* : *Famae* post obitum fingit maiora vetustas : / maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora venit. *Omnia* is easily accounted for as a marginal note (intended to suggest the object to be supplied with *fingit*) which later ousted *famae* from some MSS. But the phrase *Famae vetustas* is too rare to permit us to explain its presence here in N<sup>1</sup> as due to a similar attempt to indicate more precisely the already clear meaning of *vetustas*. *Famae* is the *lectio difficilior*, and therefore to be preferred unless it can be shown to be either bad Latin, or nonsense. Its Latinity is vouched for by a passage in Livy, which the commentators seem not to have noticed : Athenas inde plenas quidem et ipsas vetustate fama, multa tamen visenda habentis, etc. (Liv. xxxv. 27. 11.) Would it not be better, by the way, had Mr. Phillimore (who

<sup>1</sup> Or rather in N's parent, for N itself has *vetustas*—apparently an effort to make a kind of sense of what seemed to the scribe a corrupt phrase.

does not, like Mr. Hosius, capitalize his initials) printed *famae*, with a small *f*? At iii. 6. 9 the Oxford text printed Mr. Butler's *sic, ut eam incomptis etc.* N has *si cā*; O has *sicut eam*; Mr. Hosius reads *Siccine eam s.* Mr. Phillimore now reads *sic erat?* *incomptis vidisti flere capillis?* The sense is excellent, but so plain an idiom seems scarcely likely to have been corrupted. iii. 7. 43 sqq. *quod si contentus patrio bove verteret agros, / verbaque duxisset pondus habere mea, / viveret ante suos dulcis conviva Penatis, / pauper at in terra; nil, ubi flere, potes (flere potest O).* Here by taking *flere* as the indicative, and adopting *potes* from the *Dresdensis*, Mr. Phillimore would like to make Propertius say (to quote from the Oxford translation) "You would be a poor man, but alive; when you are dead the riches you risked so much to gain are of no use to you". Perhaps we might get this meaning more clearly by reading *nil, ubi fleris, opes.* (Baehrens conjectured *nil nisi (D V) fleret opes.*) Compare the same commonplace at iii. 5. 13 *haud ullas portabis opes Acherontis ad undas.*

iii. 11. 55sq. 'Non hoc, Roma, fuit tanto tibi cive ferendum!' / *dixit et assiduo lingua sepulta mero.* The MSS have *non hoc, Roma, fuit tanto tibi cive verenda.* The new Teubner text has 'Non hoc, Roma, fui tanto tibi cive verenda' / *Dixit 'et assiduo etc.'* Whether Mr. Phillimore adheres to his interpretation of the pentameter indicated in the translation: "So said even that sot's tongue swamped in endless debauch", I do not know. To my mind the most natural treatment of the distich would be to read thus: 'non hoc, Roma, fui tanto tibi cive verenda!' / *dixit, et assiduo lingua sepulta mero.* "I deserved not thy fear, Rome, seeing thou hadst this great citizen!" She said, and straightway her tongue was buried 'neath an endless flow of wine". For the idiom compare ii. 29. 10 *dixit, et in collo iam mihi nodus erat; ibid 39 sq. dixit, et opposita propellens savia dextra / prosilit in laxa nixa pedem solea: iv. 4. 67 dixit, et incerto permisit brachia somno; ibid. 91 dixit, et ingestis comitum super obruit armis.* With regard to the meaning I would point out that a reference to Antony is out of place here. He is indeed alluded to in vs. 31, but here the sense indicates that we should accept Passerat's *coniugii obsceni pretium (coniugis O and Mr. Phillimore)*, and the 'shameful wedlock' is so-called because of Cleopatra's being a party to it, not in contempt of Antony. Propertius seems to have refrained deliberately from mixing up Antony in his denunciations of the Egyptian queen. Cf. Smith on Horace, *Odes* i. 37. "Of Antony the poet is silent, conforming in this to the national feeling, which never permitted a triumph to be celebrated, except over a foreign foe", and Mr. Ramsay, Tacitus, *Annals* I p. 375<sup>1</sup>.—"the triumphs of Caesar and Augustus were never nominally celebrated as over Romans". Lachmann takes this view of our line on purely artistic grounds: "Caeterum ducis Antonii hic, ubi de feminarum imperio agit, Propertium non meminisse



plane censeo". For Cleopatra's drunkenness cf. Horace, *l. c.* vs. 14 *mentemque lymphatam Mareotico*.

iii. 13. 9 sq. *haec etiam clausas expugnant arma pudicas; / haec quaterent fastus, Icarioni, tuos (quaeque terent O)*. This conjecture has the merit of close conformity to the *ductus litterarum*, and I much prefer it to any other suggestion I am acquainted with. Another excellent emendation is that made at iii. 17. 17 *dum modo purpureo tumeant mihi dolia musto*. Here the MSS have *numen* N D V, *nūie* F, *numerem* L, *spument* s. Another good conjecture, but not, I think, quite so good as Mr. Phillimore's, is the *cumulem* of Mr. Postgate. At iii. 18. 31 Mr. Phillimore has improved on Paley, adopting his *traicit* and *portet*, and changing his *qui* to *quo*, reading: *at tibi, nauta pias hominum quo traicit umbras, / huc animae portet corpus inane tuae*: This is the most satisfactory treatment of the distich I know. At iv. 4. 55 Mr. Phillimore prints his own conjecture, first published in his Oxford text of 1901, viz. *sin hospes patria metuar regina sub aula (sic O; pariamne N, patiare D V (L), patrianue (ne F,) F, patrare L.)*. This seems to be the most emended line in Propertius. "fere dicere licet" says Mr. Hosius (Praef. XI<sup>3</sup>) "quot litterae tot coniecturae", and he cites thirty-two of them. *Pace Hosii* I will start a small owl on its way to Athens, by proposing a slight change in Mr. Phillimore's conjecture, namely to return to *sic* of the MSS (in the sense of 'if you get the *toga picta*'), making the line read: *sic, hospes, patria metuar regina sub aula?*

The book is very accurately printed, as one would expect, and I have observed no misprints. One slight error seems to have come over from the Oxford text in iii. 11. 19 sq. *ut, qui pacato statuisset in orbe columnas, / tam dura traheret mollia pensa manu*. The commas seem to be of the kind that are made in Germany.

B. O. FOSTER.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, May 4, 1912.

---

Assyrian and Babylonian Letters belonging to the Kouyunjik Collections of the British Museum. By ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER, PH. D., Professor of the Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Chicago. Parts X and XI. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.

When Prof. Harper began, in 1891, the publication of his *Corpus of Assyrian and Babylonian Letters*, it was anticipated that some three or four volumes would suffice for the texts and, after these were published, it was proposed to devote several additional volumes to translations, commentaries, indexes, etc. The material, however, has proved to be far more abundant than was expected, and now volumes X and XI have just appeared



bringing the number of published texts up to the very respectable figure of 1172, while the end is not yet in sight. So far, no volumes of indexes, translations, or commentaries have appeared, but after all the prime need and Prof. Harper's main object, as announced in his original plan, is to make these texts available for students, and in this he has certainly been successful. In the mean time the study of the Letter Literature has undergone considerable development along historical lines. For the older period we have, for example, King's Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, King of Babylon (3 vols. London, 1898-1900); Nagel, *Briefe Hammurabi's an Sin-indinam* (45 letters) B. A. iv, 434-483, with remarks by Delitzsch, pp. 483-500 (1902); Meissner's *Altbabylonische Briefe* (B. A. ii, 557-564); *Cuneiform Texts*<sup>1</sup> from Babylonian Tablets, etc., in the British Museum, Part xxix, Pl. 1-41 (contains 57 letters). For the later period, from Nabonidus to the Persian kings, there is a fine collection of 246 letters published in C. T. xxii, Pl. 1-47, and translated by R. C. Thompson in his *Babylonian Letters*, a work, by the way, which leaves much room for improvement.

The texts selected by Harper for his *Corpus* belong, with rare exceptions, to the Sargonide period and, besides being much more numerous, are far more interesting than the others, both from their varied contents and their value in matters of grammar and lexicography. Of late years increasing attention has been paid to them. Van Gelderen, for example, in an elaborate article in B. A. iv, pp. 501-545 (1902), published a selection of twenty-one of these texts with translation, transliteration, and commentary, and the distinguished Leipzig Assyriologist, Prof. Heinrich Zimmern, who first interpreted the Babylonian Penitential Psalms, has recommended the study of the epistolary texts to his students. In consequence we now have, in the *Leipziger Semitistische Studien*, edited by Professors A. Fischer and H. Zimmern, three excellent works on this subject: E. Behrens, *Assyrisch-Babylonische Briefe kultischen Inhalts, aus der Sargonidenzeit* (1906); E. Klauber, *Assyrisches Beamtentum nach Briefen aus der Sargonidenzeit* (1910); and S. C. Ylvisaker, *Zur babylonischen und assyrischen Grammatik. Untersuchung auf Grund der Briefe aus der Sargonidenzeit* (1912). The first is a study of the Assyro-Babylonian religion and religious ceremonies on the basis of information derived from the letters; the second an endeavor to define the functions and duties of the various Assyrian officials, of whom great numbers are encountered in the letters, and thus arrive at a clearer idea of the mechanism of the government; and the third is an interesting study of the grammar of the letters, and at the same time a successful effort to establish the differences existing between the Assyrian and the Babylonian dialects. In addition to these works, H. H. Figulla has published the correspondence of Bel-ibni, the well-

<sup>1</sup> Usually abbreviated as C. T.

known general of Ashurbanipal, in *Mittheilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1912, no. 1.

The new volumes of Harper's Letters are marked by the same careful editing and excellent typography that have characterized the preceding volumes. The only textual error noted by the writer occurs in vol. xi, No. 1166, rev. 5, where the precative *lipšuru* is evidently intended, and therefore the next to last character of the line must be *šu*, not *ma*, which is impossible in any case. This, however, is merely a misprint, if it be not a slip on the part of the original scribe. Among the writers of letters is a certain Pûlu, whose name is interesting as being that under which Tiglath-Pileser III. appears in the Bible. Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, is the writer of the badly mutilated letters Nos. 1022 and 1040, and perhaps also of Nos. 1001 and 1026, though if so it must have been before his accession to the throne, since they are addressed to "the king my lord". Among the other writers are the astrologers Balasî and Nabû'a, Arad-Nabû, who in H. 113 names the children of Esarhaddon, Çillâ, Nabû-xamâtû'a, and a number of others who have appeared in former volumes. In a very considerable number of cases the names of the writers are broken away, but it is sometimes possible to restore the lost name, especially in case of Bel-ibnî who seems to be positively unable to mention his enemy Nabû-bel-šumâte without swearing. Consequently when we find in H. 1000, obv. 12: *Nabû-bel-šumâte ša Nabû mašak-šu ana maxâra inamdin*, 'N. whose skin may Nabû expose for sale', and rev. 12: *sikipti arrat ilâni Nabû-bel-šumâte*, 'that abandoned wretch, accursed of the gods, N.', we may safely conclude that Bel-ibnî is the writer. The parentage of Bel-ibnî is given, by the way, in H. 1106, rev. 14, where it is stated that his father was Nabû-kudurru-uçur (i. e. Nebuchadrezzar, or Nebuchadnezzar) who had been placed in command of the Gulf District, the old dominion of the kings of Bît-Yakîn, later under the rule of Bel-ibnî himself. It is possible that they were of the line of Mero-dach-baladan, and the present writer has long had a suspicion that they may have been the progenitors of the later dynasty of Babylon, which began with Nabû-polassar and his son Nebuchadnezzar. Certainly the family of Bel-ibnî would seem to have been the most powerful family in that locality and might well fill all the necessary conditions. All this, however, is mere conjecture. Among the interesting forms and expressions to be found in the present volumes may be mentioned: *taxâzâti*, pl. of *taxâzu* 'battle', which occurs here for the first time. In H. 1105, rev. 24, we read: *Istar âšib[at Arba']il, ilat taxâzâti (taxa-sa-a-ti)* 'Istar, dwelling in Arbela, goddess of battles', so that *taxâzu* has a feminine plural. Another new word, occurring in H. 1165, obv. 8, is *â'itu*, fem. of the interrogative pronoun *â'u* 'who, which?' The unknown writer of H. 1149 remarks, rev. 6-7: *ina pân malâti gabbi labki, memeni ša libbu*

*išákanánini laššu* 'before the whole world I must weep, (and) there is no one to put heart into me'. The letters abound with similar passages, but, strangely enough, the heart as the seat of emotions and passions is not well represented in the lexicons. A few examples may be useful: *apil šipri ša šarri belia lilliká-ma, ála lušarxiš u iáši libbi tábu liškunáni* (H. 846, rev. 16-18) 'let a royal messenger come and encourage the city, and let him hearten me up also'; *libbi-ni niziqipu* (H. 1105, obv. 25) 'we shall pluck up heart'; *ki libbi-kunu epšá* (H. 1121, rev. 6) 'act according to your wish' (literally 'heart'); *ki libbi-šu* (H. 561, rev. 6) 'according to his will'; *ki libbiia luppiš* (H. 476, rev. 11) 'I will do as I please'; *ardu ša libbu-šu ana beli-šu gamuráni anáku* (H. 620, rev. 6) 'I am a servant whose heart is wholly given to his lord'.

The compound character ID, No. 11644 in Brünnow's List, is of course well-known as the ideogram of *náru* 'river', etc., but hitherto no case of its employment with a purely phonetic value has been reported. In H. 1022, obv. 2, and in H. 1040, obv. 3, it represents phonetically the last syllable of a well-known Elamite name. The latter passage has: *Tam-mar-it šar mât Elamti*, and the former [*Tam-ma*]r-it šar mât Elamti, the syllable *it* in both cases being represented by the character in question. In H. 1042, rev. 10 the official title *manzaz páni* occurs in the unusual form *ma-za-az* (= *mazzaz*) *páni* with assimilation of the *n*, and H. 1140, rev. 3-4, gives the days in the month of Iyar which *ana epšš šibáti paláx ili tábáni* 'are favorable for doing (one's) will and for worshipping the god'. Rather a delicate compliment is found in H. 1042, obv. 5, 6, where we read: *atta tattemi ki kunukki ina libáni-ka taktarar-šu* 'thou art like a seal, which thou hangest upon thy breast'. *Libánu*, which does not occur elsewhere, must here be compared to the Arabic *labán* 'breast'. Instances of the change of *k* to *g* after a nasal, which according to Ylvisaker, o. c. § 6 c, is a peculiarity of the Babylonian dialect, occur in H. 1106, rev. 10: *ramán-gunu ugrá* 'take heed to yourselves', and in H. 1114, rev. 10: *dín-gunu* 'your cause'.

Many additional examples might be cited, for the recent volumes of Harper's Letters are quite as full of interesting material as their predecessors, but these will probably suffice. The steadily increasing attention paid to the epistolary texts is a fair index of the estimation in which they are held by Assyriologists, and it is to be hoped that Prof. Harper, who has made the letters of the Sargonide period so peculiarly his own domain, may find material for many additional volumes of these interesting and valuable texts.

CHRISTOPHER JOHNSTON.

## REPORTS.

### HERMES XLIII.

#### Fascicle 3.

Frontonis platani (zu Juvenal Sat. I, 7 ff.) A. von Premerstein interprets this passage as a satire (112-116 A. D.) on a group of court poets, admirers of V. Flaccus, who had bored Juvenal (85-90 A. D.) with their wearisome repetitions and expansions of topics suggested by the Argonautica. He further identifies, from inscriptional evidence, the Frontonis platani (l. c.) with a spot, known as le Marmorelle, which is situated fifteen miles from Rome near the Via Labicana. Here *παρὰ ταῖς πλατάνοις* (IG. XIV, 1011) existed, toward the end of the first century A. D., a *Μουσεῖον*, devoted to poetical, musical and athletic contests, which seems to have been part of a villa built by a certain Fronto, once slave of the augur Lentulus, then dispensator in the retinue of the Emperor Claudius (cf. CIL V. 2386). After Domitian had instituted his agon Albanus (circ. 89 A. D.) it seems to have fallen into decay, to which Juvenal gives a humorous turn in vv. 12-13.

Phaedrus-Studien, II (cf. A. J. P. XXIX, 491). G. Thiele has shown that the prose version of Aesopic fables, preserved in MSS of the X. century and later, known as Romulus, represents an illustrated edition made about 400 A. D., primarily from an older illustrated, presumably Greek, Aesop and to a less degree from Phaedrus. The interpolations from the latter have given the impression that Romulus is merely a prose paraphrase of Phaedrus (cf. G. Thiele, *Der illustrierte Lat. Aesop, and Romulus*). This investigation aims to reconstruct such fables as may be classified as burlesques among the gods (Phaedr. I, 6; IV, 18 (19); Append. 9; Luc. Müller, *Fab. Novae* 17) or as novelettes (Phaedr. III, 10; Append. 13 and 14), and from a comparison with Romulus, who exists in two recensions, Thiele shows that Phaedrus often suffers from excessive brevity and arbitrary changes. Light is thrown on Phaedrus' method and on the mixture of his text with vulgar Latin in the Romulus versions.

Philumenos. M. Wellmann gives an account of the Vatican MS, gr. 284, s. XI, discovered by him, which contains, besides Galen (VI-XI) etc., Philumenus *περὶ λοβόλων ζώων καὶ τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς βοηθημάτων*. Philumenus is shown to have been a contemporary of Galen (about 180 A. D.) and, like Oribasius (IV century), was a compiler. He drew largely from the Pneumatic school (Archigenes, etc.) and, as he usually names the sources that he used or

received, he would be a valuable aid, together with Nicander and other writers mentioned by W., in reconstructing Apollodorus (300 B. C.), the founder of toxicology. For the later tradition W. shows that Philumenus passed through Oribasius to Aetius (VI century); Paulus Aegineta (VII century) and Pseudo-Dioscurides (VI or VII century). The two latter are independent of each other, except that the text of Ps.-Diosc. was interpolated from Paulus; hence Schneider (*Handb. d. Gesch. d. M.*, I 553) erred in saying that Paulus copied from Ps.-Dioscurides. The MS is also valuable for emending the text of Aetius.

Zur Cirisfrage. A. B. Drachmann tries to prove that the Ciris was composed by Vergil about 50 B. C., but not published; hence he felt free to use it. Vergil did borrow from his earlier works (cf. *Aen.* VIII 449-453 = *Geor.* IV 172-175; *Aen.* VI 306-308 = *Geor.* IV 475-477). In maintaining his thesis D. not only addresses himself to Skutsch, Leo and Sudhaus (cf. *A. J. P.* XXXI, 478); but gives valuable results of his metrical and linguistic investigations to emphasize the generally admitted neoteric style of the Ciris.

Zu Xenophons kleineren Schriften (Hieron, Agesilaos, Apologie). Th. Thalheim discusses the relationship of the MSS, using an unpublished collation made by K. Schenkl for the Agesilaos. He finds, especially from the lacunae, that they all depend on the oldest MS, A (=Vat. s. XII); but the corrections by the second hand are merely conjectures (Tretter and Fuhr think they were derived from a MS). D (=Vat. 1950, s. XIV) is often valuable for restoring the erasures in A. Th. proposes a number of emendations and questions Xenophon's authorship for the Apology, as the humorous passage in Antisthenes' speech in *Symp.* IV, 41 recurs seriously in *Apol.* 18.

Die Steingewichte von Marzabotto. P. Graffunder discusses twenty-three stones of various weights, found at Marzabotto, the Etruscan Pompeii (cf. Brizio, *Monum. ant. d. R. Accad. d. Lincei* I, 1889, 520) and determines their units, on the basis of which he outlines the commercial history of M. He finds examples of four grades of the Phoenician light silver mina, which confirms Lehmann's theory (*Hermes* XXXVI, p. 130), also examples of the Lydian mina of Croesus, of the Attic *μνᾶ ἐμπορική*, etc. Most of these units, originating in Babylonia, were brought to Etruria by way of Asia Minor and Greece, or of Phoenicia and Carthage (550-400 B. C.) Only two stones, marked 1, give approximately the actual unit, the rest contain multiples indicated by Etruscan symbols representing chiefly five, ten or the tenfold value shown by an additional stroke, the resemblance of which to Chalcidic aspirates is due to evolution and, possibly, assimilation. Zange-meister's theory of the origin of the Italic numeral signs seems correct after all.



κατάρχεσθαι und ἐνάρχεσθαι. P. Stengel shows that at a meat-offering the worshippers followed a leader in the rite of κατάρχεσθαι, which consisted in the χερνίπτεσθαι and οὐλόχευται, chiefly the latter (cf. A. J. P. XXV, 220). The cutting off of the victim's forelock and the prayer were separate acts, performed by the leader alone, although the worshippers joined in invoking the god. Hence the κατάρχεσθαι of the leader was virtually a προκατάρχεσθαι (πρό, temporal). These results rectify Dittenberger's famous interpretation of Thuc. I 25 (cf. Classen-Steup l. c. and Rh. Mus. 59, 400ff.) The term ἐνάρχεσθαι, which is always joined with τὸ κανοῦν or τὰ κανᾶ, means to sanctify the basket by the inlaying of the οὐλαί.

Miscellen: Giov. Pinza argues interestingly that the Homeric phrase χρυσὸν περιχεύειν (cf. Od. γ, 425 ff.) originated from the mercury-amalgam process (cf. Pliny N. H. 33, 125), the employment of which in archaic times is doubted by Helbig (Das Hom. Epos, p. 267).—H. Jacobsohn makes it probable that Antium belonged to the tribe Camilia (cf. Corp. VI, 13470), and supports his view with a Dalmatian inscription (cf. Corp. III, 2887), where Ansio (= Antio) gives an example of  $ti > si$  that is not later than 150 A. D.—U. Wilcken supplies παρὰ τὴν Μεσσηνίδα, etc., in the Hellenica fragments from Oxyrhynchus (cf. V. 842), making the agreement with Strabo XIII, p. 629, complete and thus establishing the authorship of Theopompus.—Th. Reinach emends Ptolemaeus Harmonica II 10 so as to read: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἴσως τόνους (for ἰσοτόνους) αὐτοὺς ὀνομάζοντες. As the Doric, Phrygian and Lydian scales differed by a whole tone, 'therefore perhaps calling them τόνοι', a stupid etymology.—M. Ihm has found extracts from Cassianus' Consolatio 5 in the Pseudo-Rufinus commentary to the Psalms, which is mainly dependent on Augustine's Enarrationes Psalmorum. As the Consolatio was written 426–429 A. D., a terminus post quem is obtained for the anonymus, who was probably Vincentius (Gennad. vir. ill. 80) who, being at home in Gaul, would know Cassianus the 'Gallicanus doctor' (cf. A. J. P. XXVI, p. 230).

#### Fascicle 4.

De inscriptionis Phrynichaeae partis ultimae lacunis explendis. I. M. J. Valetton discusses at length the decree conferring a crown and citizenship on Thrasybulus the Calydonian (CIA, I 59, Hicks 56). Bergk was the first to connect it with Lysias XIII 71 f., and so with the assassination of Phrynichus 411 B. C. (Thuc. VIII 92). Except for the identification and nearer definition of the locality (cf. Lycurgus, in Leocr. 112), the orators are valueless; even Thucydides, writing without the fuller knowledge of the decree, passed 409 B. C., records no names, but merely the current belief created by the testimony of the Argive accomplice, who to shield his associates, cast suspicion on the περίπολοι; but these Athenian guardsmen did not include

foreigners, as has been inferred from Thuc. VIII 92 (cf. Gilbert, *Beiträge zur innern Gesch. Ath.*, p. 320.) V. rejects the theory of two decrees honoring Thrasybulus, of a reward offered the unknown assassins, and that Apollodorus had been temporarily debarred by a *γραφὴ παρανόμων*. It must have been the decree of Demophantus (Andoc. I 96) that induced Apollodorus to return and receive as a reward the confiscated property of Phrynichus (cf. Lysias VII 4, where the name of Pisander is probably an error). Then Thrasybulus, hearing of Apollodorus' success, returned; others also presented themselves as accomplices. The investigation of bribery (in the second rider) was entrusted to the *βουλὴ* of the Areopagus. V. supplies the lacunae to this effect with a detailed justification.

Varia. I. Vahlen, among other things, proposes *Ἀγάθωνος* in apposition with *ένός* in Plat. Symp. 176 B; reads, in *περί ὕψους* I 2, p. 2, 15, *ἀληθέστατα <καὶ εὐεργετικώτατα>*; calls attention to an iota subscript in the perf. pass. of *διαίρειν*, which has been overlooked from the time of Ruhnken, in *περί ὕψους* VII 1, p. 11, 20, and II 2, p. 3, 20, also elsewhere; to illustrate 'Cyprio bovi merendam' in the Sota of Ennius, cites Athen. III, p. 95 f. Then follows a defense of three passages of his text of Ennius' Iphigenia against Skutsch in Rh. Mus. LXI, 1906, p. 605 f.

Über kleinasiatische Grabinschriften. Br. Keil presents a wealth of observations on the language and content of these inscriptions and the mutual influence of the Greek and Latin. He restores BCH XXIII, 178 n. 32, deriving *θυγαθράσιον* (outside of Egypt mutes for aspirates occur oftener than the reverse, cf. *τυγάτηρ*); *κατάστρομα* (= roof over sarcophagus); *συστοιχίση* (= *συστοιχίσση* 'to stand by', 'help'). The *πελεκένοι* are clamps (cf. *κόρακες*), which leads him to supply in Heberdey-Wilhelm Reisen in Kilikien, n. 94 D, *σκυ] λεύση* for *σα] λεύση*, which latter does not mean 'to injure'. He objects to Mayser's designation of *Φερσεφόνη* as *altpoetisch-attisch*; for only *Περσεφόνη* is old Ionic, i. e., epic. The latter came into Attic prose through the drama and so into general use. *Φερσεφόνη* (cf. Pindar, Bacchylides, Plato Crat. 404 C) became the Koine form, the influence of which appears in the MSS of Homer. The inscriptions show variety; but regularly begin with *Φερσ.*; *Περσ.* is rare or doubtful (cf. Preller, Gr. Myth., p. 800, Jebb Antiq. 894, Meiterhaus' 100, 888). CIG 3776 refers to a sarcophagus (*πύαλος*) cut out of the native rock (*φουτήν*=*φυτήν*), and to another as *ἐπεισάνκτην* (*ἐπεισάκτην*), and measures *ἀπὸ τῆς 'Ρούας* (= 'street' from the vulg. Lat. *ruga*; French *rue*), perhaps the oldest example of *ruga* in this sense. In n. 539 of Sterrett, Wolfe Expedition occurs *ἐξεδόμην*; this vb. means here 'to draw up, engross', not 'to publish'. In a bilingual inscription from Egypt *Σατορνείλος* = Saturninus, and the Greek characteristically rounds off as 'two months' the 'one month and twenty-eight days' of the Latin. Certain Roman formulae

appear in Greek sepulch. insc., viz., *τοῦτο τὸ μνημεῖον κληρονόμοις οὐκ ἀκολουθήσει* renders literally HMHNS. The use of the single *deferre* aided the levelling of the originally distinct *μηνύειν, ἐνδείκνυται, εἰς-προσαγγέλλειν*, etc. But specifically Roman ideas like that of 'tutela' could not be transferred, and, correspondingly, the Greek conceptions of *τυμβωρυχία, ἱεροσυλία ἀσέβεια*, etc., remained foreign to the Roman. However in the II century A. D. there appear in both Gk. and Lat. sepulch. insc. threats of pecuniary penalties. Hirschfeld traced the origin of this formula to Lycia, where it appears in the III century B. C. Kaibel shows its occurrence in Nabataean inscr. as early as the year I A. D., and thinks it originated in the Greek legal formularies of the rights of property and obligation, of which the sepulch. inscr. merely show a special application. This explains the rights of the testator and his relation to the community, his legal executor. This broader basis throws light on the sporadic appearance and transmission of these threats. Witness the close resemblance between the formularies of the Hellenistic inscriptions and the Egyptian papyri.

Thucydides VIII. U. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff points out Thucydides' use of doublet passages as connecting links, thus the Sicilian and Ionian wars are joined by repetitions from VIII 1, 3 in VIII 4 (cf. also I 146-II, 1; II, 1-V, 24; and even V 39-40). This device prepared the way for the structure of the prose book, first evolved by Theopompus and Ephorus. With due acknowledgment to Holzapfel (cf. A. J. P. XVI, 391) W. reaches the conclusion that Thucydides inserted, from a Spartan source, the treaties (18. 37. 58) and chapters 29. 43. 44. 52. 57 into the already completed history of the year 412 B. C., which had been based on a Chian source and information touching Phrynichus and Alcibiades, obtained from Athenian emigrants; hence the lack of criticism of the former and the unfavorable light cast on the latter. Plato's Symposium gives the truest conception of Alcibiades' character. Isocrates, Lysias & Co. merely repeat political phrases. The new matter brought inconsistencies into VIII, which were never smoothed out. The histories of the Sicilian and Ten Years' Wars were written as such; but only a beginning was made of writing the history of the Twenty-seven Years' War. This explains the incompleteness of Book V and the lack of a clear exposition of the conditions in Asia with reference to Persia. Book VIII in its first form, without the treaties, etc., was probably written soon after 411 B. C. W. also discusses the conflicting accounts concerning Hermocrates and, finally, presents some interesting emendations. He believes that Thucydides suffers from conservative criticism.

Zu Martial. G. Friedrich discusses twenty-six epigrams of M., including more in his wealth of illustrations. In most cases he

offers interpretations of misunderstood epigrams, often to support the received text or to defend neglected or suspected MS readings. He traces the origin of corruptions, throws light on the MSS and, incidentally, on the work of modern scholars (cf. also Rh. M., 1907). He addresses himself principally to Friedländer, Duff and Lindsay, citing them individually or together, mainly to show the need of interpretation and emendation. Lindsay, whose groupings of MSS he adopts, has evidently come to his notice since writing the other article. In XII 59, 9 he adopts Heinsius' conjecture, which yields (transposing hinc) *dest oculis*, from which originated †*dexiochulus* † (Lindsay and Duff) and the unreal *desioculus* (Georges, Harper). In XIV 177 he translates *respicit* 'fears', a rare meaning not yet recognized in the dictionaries (cf. K. P. Schulze, *Beiträge z. Erklärung d. röm. Elegiker Progr.*, Berlin, 1893). He points out Martial's fondness for post positive *et* and *que*, viz.: in II 46, 7 *pro scelus! et* = *et pro scelus*; in X 48, 2 *et pilata redit iamque subitque cohors* = *et p. et iam redit et subit cohors*. *Totum servare* = *integrum s.* in X 34, 5 is probably vulg. Lat., cf. causal *dum* in IV 62 and *manere*, 'to spend the night' in VIII 14, 6.

Miscellen: L. Deubner interprets Pind. Ol. II 57-60 *ὅτι θανόντων κτλ.*, 'on earth (*ἐνθάδε*) the people straightway wreak their vengeance on the tyrant by not allowing burial, etc.; under the earth (*κατὰ γᾶς*), *τις* pronounces judgment; *ἐν τᾷδε Διὸς ἀρχῇ* means 'under the rule of Zeus' (cf. Plat. Gorg. 523). There is no apodosis to this passage beginning *εἰ δέ νιν ἔχων τις οἶδεν τὸ μέλλον ὅτι θανόντων κτλ.*; but the suspense reaches its climax in the praise of Theron.—O. Seeck supports L. Ziehen's emendation of Cic. ad Att. II 17, 2 (cf. A. J. P. XX, 218) against the difficulty raised by Wissowa (*Relig. u. Kult. d. Röm.*, p. 293, A 1) by showing from the passage of Tertullian (ad nat. I 10) that the Isis statue had been overthrown once, before the consulship of Gabinius, i. e., not later than 59 B. C. The epithet *Curiana* illustrates the interest of private persons in the Egyptian gods (cf. Dio 40, 47), in this case perhaps of Q. Curius (cf. Pauly-Wissowa IV, p. 1840. and Apul. met. XI 30).—K. Meiser emends Marc. Aurel. 10, 15 *ζησον ὡς ἐν <πορείᾳ>* (cf. Plat. Phaedo 115 a and Seneca dial. XI 11, 2) and translates the whole passage.—F. Bechtel considers *-φοος* in the name *Ἀγησίφοος* (cf. Blass Coll. 5055 d) an ablaut form of *-φεος* in *ἀργύφεος*.—P. Stengel shows that *ῥαῖα* and *νεκίσια* are both appellatives and that the *Νεμέσεια* and *Γενέσια* are not identical (cf. Rohde Psych. I 216, n. 2 (235 f.) and Hesychius s. v. *ῥαῖα*).

HERMAN LOUIS EBELING.

GOUCHER COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

## ROMANIA, Vol. XL (1911).

Janvier.

E. Philippon. *L'U long latin dans le domaine rhodanien*. 16 pages. The author here endeavors to combat the theory long since in favor that Celtic influence caused the long U in Latin to become the French U. He draws his material from the dialects of the Rhone Valley, where early Greek transcriptions of Gallic names afford a valuable key to the pronunciation.

Antoine Thomas. *Variétés bibliographiques*. 24 pages. I. Variations sur la dernière strophe d'Aliscans. II. Le Liber Galteri du Trésor des chartes. III. Le N° 10 des manuscrits français de Francesco Gonzaga. IV. La Chace aus mesdisans de Raimon Vidal. V. Remarques sur trois ballades politiques du temps de Charles VI. VI. Un ms. oublié, un ms. perdu, un ms. prétendu du Débat des Hérauts d'armes. VII. Trois lettres de Thomassin de Mazaugues à La Curne de Sainte-Palaye.

Paul Meyer. *Notice du ms. Egerton 745 du Musée britannique* (2<sup>e</sup> article). 29 pages. Appendice. *Vie en prose de Saint Edouard, roi d'Angleterre*. The author of the article outlines the investigations necessary for a careful critical edition, citing extracts from one Latin and two French versions.

*Mélanges*. P. Meyer, *Fragment du Comput de Philippe de Thaon* (with facsimile). P. Meyer, *Le dit du boudin*. Giulio Bertoni, *Una poesia provenzale infrancesata*. A. Jeanroy, *Modèles profanes de chansons pieuses*. Gertrude Schoepperle, *Sur un vers de la Folie Tristan de Berne*. Mario Roques, *Anc. franç. Jobreus, -se*. F. Rechnitz, *Fenestre dans le Roman de Rou*. Edmond Faral, *Pour l'histoire de Berte au grand pied et de Marcoul et Salomon*. A. Thomas, *Deux documents inédits sur Pierre Bersuire*. A. Thomas, *Saint-Martin-Valmeroux*.

*Comptes rendus*. W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1<sup>re</sup> livraison (A. Thomas). Dietrich Behrens, *Beiträge zur französischen Wortgeschichte und Grammatik: Studien und Kritiken* (A. Thomas). R. Zenker, *Die Tristansage und das persische Epos von Wîs und Râmîn*; Jacob Kelemina, *Untersuchungen zur Tristansage* (G. Schoepperle). Jean Beck, *La musique des Troubadours; étude critique illustrée de douze reproductions hors texte* (Mario Roques). Edw. Jaernstroem, *Recueil de chansons pieuses du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle* (A. Jeanroy). E. Faral, *Mimes français du XIII<sup>e</sup> siècle: Textes, notices et glossaire* (A. Jeanroy). Ernst Hoepffner, *La Prise amoureuse von Jehan Acart de Hesdin, allegorische Dichtung aus dem XIV. Jahrhundert* (Gaston Raynaud, with supplementary note by Paul



Meyer). J. Douglas Bruce, *Mort Artu, an Old French prose romance of the XIII<sup>th</sup> century* (Jessie L. Weston, with supplementary note by Paul Meyer). Carl August Westerblad, "Baro" et ses dérivés dans les langues romanes (A. Thomas). G. Pașcu, *Despre cimilituri, studiu filologic și folkloric; partea I* (Mario Roques). N. Cartojan, *Alexandria în literatura românească* (Mario Roques). D. Russo, *Studii și critice* (Mario Roques).

Périodiques. *Romanische Forschungen*, XXI, fasc. 1-3, XXII, fasc. 1-3, XXIII, XXIV (Mario Roques). *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen*, Helsingfors, 11<sup>e</sup> année, 12<sup>e</sup> année (P. M.). *Annales du Midi*, XXII (A. Th.). *Mémoires de la Société de linguistique*, t. XIV, fasc. 1-6 (A. Thomas, with notes on etymologies). *Jahresbericht des Instituts für rumänische Sprache zu Leipzig*, XVI (Mario Roques, with notes on etymologies). *Reale Istituto Lombardo di scienze e lettere, Rendiconti, serie II*, t. XLIII.

Chronique. Obituary notice of A. Marshall Elliott by P. M. ("Il obtint . . . la première chaire de langues romanes qui ait été fondée aux États-Unis, si bien que la plupart des Américains qui enseignèrent plus tard les langues romanes ont été ses élèves." Personal reminiscences.) Announcement of Studies in honor of A. Marshall Elliott.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 7 titles. Ernesto Monaci, *Antichissimo ritmo volgare sulla legenda di Sant' Alessio*.

Avril.

Edmond Faral. *Ovide et quelques autres sources du Roman d'Enéas*. 74 pages. The author has been engaged on an extensive work of comparison between the French romances of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and certain Classical works which may have served as sources for much of their material. The present article merely treats that phase which includes the borrowings of the *Roman d'Enéas*, which itself served as a source for a whole series of later romances in French. It is evident that the Old French author knew his Ovid thoroughly, as he mingles episodes drawn from all of the latter's works. Later on such imitations became quite the vogue in France.

G. Huet. *Le Château tournant dans la Suite du Merlin*. 8 pages. This strange Celtic tradition is found in a great variety of literary works in various countries. Their possible interrelations are here discussed at some length.

C. Chabaneau et J. Anglade. *Essai de reconstitution du Chansonnier du Comte de Sault*. 80 pages. When M. Chabaneau died he left unfinished a projected edition of Jean de Nostredame. The present article was intended by him as a separate publication, but this too was unfinished; it has been completed and published

by M. Anglade. Jean de Nostredame states that he had seen two large tomes containing the biographies and poems of more than eighty Provençal troubadours. The attempt is here made to identify them and to learn something definite as to their works. Various tables and lists are added which will greatly facilitate future references to the important material here presented after a delay of some thirty years from the inception of the work.

Jean Haust. *Etymologies wallonnes*. 8 pages. Ten dialect words or groups of words are here discussed in some detail, with frequent reference to Grandgagnage and other authorities.

Mélanges. A. Thomas, Berrichon Asté, Sté. A. Thomas, Anc. prov. Esbrigar.

Comptes rendus. Arthur C. L. Brown, *The Bleeding Lance* (G. Schoepperle). Santorre Debenedetti, *Gli studi provenzali in Italia nel cinquecento* (Giulio Bertoni).

Périodiques. Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, XXII-XXIV (P. Meyer makes many interesting and spicy comments on the Romance articles, especially on those of H. C. Lancaster, F. M. Warren, George C. Keidel, W. A. Nitze and J. E. Matzke).

Chronique. Awarding of four prizes by the French academies, among them the Premier prix Gobert to M. Bédier for his work entitled: *Les légendes épiques*.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 10 titles. Gustav George Laubscher, *The past tenses in French* (favorable notice by H. Yvon). Henry Martin, *Notes on the syntax of the Latin inscriptions found in Spain* (H. Yvon notes among other things that the deviations from the normal usage are less frequent than in the Latin inscriptions of Gaul). A. Philippide, *Un specialist român la Lipsea* (Mario Roques calls attention to the large number of notes here given to the work of G. Weigand and his pupils during many years). Dante Alighieri, *La divina Commedia*, edited and annotated by C. H. Grandgent, vol. II.

Juillet.

Antoine Thomas. *Traduction provençale abrégée de la Mulo-medicina de Teodorico Borgognoni, suivie de Recettes pour le vin*. 18 pages. The introduction to this article treats of the author, translator and manuscripts. After this comes a much curtailed Provençal text, the recipes, and a detailed glossary.

Emmanuel Cosquin. *Le conte du Chat et de la chandelle dans l'Europe du moyen âge et en orient*. I<sup>er</sup> article. 60 pages. This, the first of several articles treating of a worldwide story, is divided into two parts which discuss respectively the European

and the non-European forms of the apologue and tale. In 1875 Reinhold Köhler published a short essay on the same subject, but since that time so much new material has become accessible that a general reëxamination of the whole field is fully warranted.

The many questions here investigated are of great interest to students of folk-lore and fable literature, as well as to those who devote their attention to the popular story. The first point to be taken up is the mediaeval story of Solomon and Markolf, in connection with which a lengthy excursus is given on the Latin and French versions.

After this certain French and German variants are studied, and among them an Old French fable entitled *Du chat qui savoit tenir chandoile*, which A.C.M. Robert in 1825 attributed wrongly to Marie de France. The same story has been inserted in a condensed form in *Li Proverbe au vilain*.

The second part treats of the numerous variants of the tale to be found in the literatures of China, India and the Barbary states. These Oriental stories have given rise to many ramifications, and some of these have in turn been the starting-point for groups of European tales. And in this connection another excursus is given on the legend of the Predestined bride.

Benvenuto Aron Terracini. *Appunti sui "Parlamenti ed epistole"* in antico dialetto piemontese. 9 pages. The notes here given are largely etymological in character, and they touch upon many points of linguistic development on the Italian peninsula.

Mélanges. A. Thomas, *Anc. franç. Beur.* A. Thomas, *Encore Scieur de long.* A. Thomas, *Le pont de Mautrible, à Saintes.* A. Thomas, *Encore Goufier de Lastours.* T. Atkinson Jenkins, *La chanson de Bele Doe dans Guillaume de Dole.* Giulio Bertoni, *Nuovi versi provenzali di Percivalle Doria.*

Comptes rendus. Susan Almira Bacon, *The Source of Wolfram's Willehalm* (M. J. Minckwitz). Pierre Champion, *La librairie de Charles d'Orléans* (A. Thomas). H. J. Molinier, *Essai biographique sur Octavien de Saint-Gelays* (Mathieu Augé-Chiquet). A. Farinelli, *Dante e la Francia dall'età media al secolo di Voltaire* (A. Jeanroy).

Chronique. Obituary notices of Charles Gustave Estlander († 1910), Auguste Longnon, Gaston Raynaud and Rufin José Cuervo. The last three of these scholars were well-known collaborators on the Romania. Commemorative volume presented to Pio Rajna on June 6, 1911. Prospective publication of the *Dictionnaire de l'ancien français* compiled by the late Adolf Tobler.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 6 titles. Joseph Anglade, *Les Troubadours, leurs vies, leurs œuvres, leur influence.* N.-E.

Dionne, *Le parler populaire des Canadiens français*. Albert Ravanat, *Dictionnaire du patois des environs de Grenoble*.

Octobre.

Emmanuel Cosquin. *Le contre du Chat et de la chandelle dans l'Europe du moyen âge et en orient (Suite et fin)*. 51 pages. This article concludes the second section of the second part, and contains the entire third part of the whole investigation. Our story is found again in an Arabian tale of Tunis (accompanied here by an excursus on the Chaste woman and her suitors), and in a Berber tale further to the south. The story is also found in Central Asia and elsewhere.

The third part of the investigation is devoted to the versions current in the folk-lore of Modern Europe, and more especially to a Roumanian tale quite recently committed to print.

In conclusion the author gives expression to certain general ideas on the folk-lore field, which are of wide application. One of the questions which inevitably present themselves in such work is whether all the tales which resemble each other closely go back to a common and remote original, or whether the fundamental idea may not have presented itself spontaneously to the writers of a score of different countries.

This again emphasizes the fact that in studying the origin and propagation of popular tales the important point to consider is the mode of presentation of the common theme in the various literatures. It is the concrete, not the abstract, that should be studied.

P. Meyer. *Notice du ms. Sloane 1611 du Musée britannique (Une poésie de Nicole Bozon.—Traité français de médecine.—Vie de sainte Marguerite)*. 27 pp. The second part of this manuscript, the only portion considered here, was written by a French scribe in the second half of the thirteenth century. An English scribe of the following century added a poem to be attributed with certainty to Nicole Bozon. Portions of this text have become illegible through much thumbing. The remainder of the manuscript is a copy by a French scribe of Anglo-Norman originals. A facsimile of one page of the manuscript is appended.

Arthur Långfors. *Du Mesdisant par Perrin La Tour* (Bibl. nat. fr. 25462). 7 pages. Introduction, text and glossary.

Arthur Långfors. *Li Despisemens du Cors* (Bibl. nat. fr. 25462). 5 pages. Introduction and text.

A. Thomas. *Les Manuscrits français et provençaux des ducs de Milan au château de Pavie*. 39 pages. In the year 1426 there was drawn up a *Consignatio librorum* of the library in question, which contained no less than 988 articles. This Latin text is here carefully edited, with voluminous foot-notes com-

menting on the descriptions given by the mediaeval author, and endeavoring to identify them with extant manuscripts in various libraries.

Mélanges. E. Walberg, *Anc. franç. Estovoir*. Johan Vising, *La rime Met: Bec dans le Bestiaire de Philippe de Thaon*. A. Thomas, *Galeroux dans la Folie Tristan de Berne*. A. Thomas, *Sur l'expression La Sent Johan Mostoza dans une charte gasconne (1262)*.

Comptes rendus. Reginald Harvey Griffith, *Sir Perceval of Galles: A Study of the Sources of the Legend* (Jessie L. Weston: "Mr. Griffith deserves the thanks of all Arthurian scholars for having placed at their disposal much interesting and valuable material").

Chronique. Obituary notices of Wilhelm Cloëtta, Gustave Gröber and Édouard Forestié. Appointment of D. S. Blondheim at the University of Illinois.

Livres annoncés sommairement. 3 titles. T. Atkinson Jenkins, *A New Fragment of ... Gui de Warewic*.

GEORGE C. KEIDEL.



## BRIEF MENTION.

In my world of dreams there lives and moves a Brief History of Greek Literature in which the space allotted to each author is measured by the rôle he has played in the literary annals of the English tongue. The theme was suggested many years ago by Dante's perspective of classical literature, so different from ours; and in the hands of one equal to the task the results would be not uninteresting, especially if the statistical method were applied. Mythical names like Orpheus, semi-mythical names like Arion, are familiar as household words. The false Anakreon has effaced the true Anakreon. Compare the angle subtended by Archilochos, the angle subtended by Theognis, if measured by their remains, if measured by the mention of them in English literature. Nor is it always the great names that count in reference and in influence, and in Dr. SAMUEL LEE WOLFF's monograph, *The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction* (Columbia University Press), we find an illustration of the disparity which I have signalized. The book will doubtless challenge the attention of competent critics. *Brief Mention* is equal only to a summary of the contents. It is made up of two parts. In Part One—*The Greek Romances*—which takes up nearly half the volume, Dr. WOLFF presents us with an elaborate study of the Theagenes and Chariclea of Heliodorus, the Clitophon and Leucippe of Achilles Tatius, the Daphnis and Chloe attributed to one Longus. For various reasons the names Daphnis and Chloe have a hold on modern literature that the others have never gained: and Longus, the mere shadow of a name, brings up to every scholar the droll misadventure of the French Hellenist, Paul-Louis Courier, brings up to me the memory of my lamented friend, John Henry Wheeler, who during the summer of 1880 turned his back on the allurements of Paris in order to collate a MS of Longus in the Bibliothèque Nationale. Sad to relate, after his death only a few Sibylline leaves of the collation were discovered among his papers, and Wheeler's critical edition of Longus, which would have been distinctly worth while, never saw the light. Nonne fuit satius? is a sigh that makes itself heard from the depth of the scholar's experience of life as well as from the melodious verse of bucolic and elegiac poet; and after all it might be better even for the staid mother of the Muses now and then to throw her cap over the mills of the gods—grind they never so fine.

And fine is the grist ground by Dr. WOLFF, and the possibilities of the intrusion of alien matter are incalculable; but I am not going to indulge in microscopic criticism. It is enough to emphasize here the importance of the work for the student of English literature. As Dr. WOLFF sums it up: 'Heliodorus and Longus are respectively secondary and primary sources of Shakespeare'; 'Lyly's Euphues probably occupies a place in a long tradition that goes back to Greek Romance'; 'both Sidney and Greene were steeped in the matter and the style of Greek fiction, and Sidney went so far as to remodel his *Arcadia* after the pattern of Heliodorus' narrative'.

---

In Part One the introductory chapter deals with the general characteristics and chronology of the three romances, with analyses of the stories themselves. The second chapter treats of Character, Humour, Setting, Structure, Style. An interchapter has to do with the accessibility of the chief of the Greek Romances to the Elizabethan writers, and forms a supplement to the tabular exhibit given in the opening of the book. In Part Two the author sets forth the obligations of John Lyly, Sir Philip Sidney, Robert Greene, and Thomas Nash to the aforesaid Greek Romances. Appendices A, B and C, a Bibliography, and Index, without which no book deserves to live, complete the work.

---

A perfunctory notice this of an ambitious work, and Dr. WOLFF may be inclined to join in the remonstrance of a German publisher, who wrote to me the other day, 'None of your perfunctory notices. We have no use for anything but substantial reviews', as if in the vast majority of cases anything more than the acknowledgment among *Books Received* were possible for the Journal, as if some of the German philological magazines did not refuse to guarantee even that (A. J. P. XVII 390). And so with acquired hardihood I proceed to say some of the obvious things about this whole line of research, which is black with investigators, who, to use the familiar figure of Dryden, are tracking the moderns in the snow of the ancients. That we are all debtors to our predecessors from the time when 'Omer smote 'is bloomin' lyre' down to the time of Stahl's Syntax of the Greek Verb is freely admitted, but this general acknowledgment does not suffice. We not only strip the jackdaw of his feathers and trace each feather to the part of the bird from which it is taken, but we run down the fable of the feathers itself to its ultimate source. The quest has the irresistible charm of the

detective story. One becomes a Gaboriau, a Sherlock Holmes. It is so throughout the whole field of philology. Whence that interpretation? Whence that emendation? Whence that formula? The whole thing is a tradition from the days of the Alexandrian *grammatici*; and the fragments thereof remain in the scholia. Our modern methods are more exact, more persistent, and there are few of our leaders who dare say with Wilamowitz that like Plato they care more for the λόγος than for οἱ λέγοντες. In periods of creative activity your healthy ancient, yes, your healthy modern, troubled himself little about sources, about the charge of plagiarism. These periods over, the packs of Alexandrian scholars, of modern scholars, have busied themselves in nosing out the origin of this fancy and that fancy, this and that story. No man is supposed to have a brook of his own; everybody is supposed to have drawn from the tank of some other man, as Coleridge puts it. What would Shakespeare have cared about all the proofs of his indebtedness? Molière snapped his fingers at those who made him out to be under heavy obligations to Spain. And, to cite a very modern instance, Charles Reade was notoriously a thief of the world. 'The pedigree of honey', sings the New England Sappho, 'Does not concern the bee'. Most assuredly it did not concern the Matinian bee. It did not concern Vergil. The Roman poets rifled Greek prose as well as Greek poetry. Every fresh find of Greek lyric fragments contributes to the sources of Horace. But as has been well said: If Alkaios and the rest of the nine lyric poets were to rise from the dead, Horace would still be Horace. Hesiod's τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες εἰκότα τέκνα γονεῦσιν reappears in 'laudantur simili prole puerperae', but there is a malicious tang of Horatian honey in 'laudantur', such as we do not find in Nossis's version (A. P. VI 353: ἡ καλὸν ὄκκα πέλοι τέκνα γονεῦσιν ἴσα. To be sure, it fretted me not long ago to find Sappho's γλυκύπικρον ascribed to Poseidippos, as has been done by those who ought to know better; but γλυκύπικρον may not have been original with Sappho. There is no 'Chi l'ha detto', no 'L'Esprit des Autres' for those early times. It does not follow necessarily that Propertius should have taken from Vergil the 'Nonne fuit satius' that I have just quoted. 'I do not remember', says a recent writer, 'who first inverted Franklin's sententious remark about not asking for luxuries'. Why should he want to remember the origin of any thought so obvious? Why identify the author of the pronouncement as to the relative value of luxuries and necessities? Some French writer calls him a 'fils de Gavarni', and at the name Garvanni there rises to my mind's eye out of the flood of years the image of a shirt-sleeved philosopher, polishing his boots, with an opera ticket protruding from his waist-coat pocket, and the legend, 'Pourquoi se priver du superflu quand on peut se passer du nécessaire'? At my present distance from libraries, this secondary source must suffice me.

And so, I must confess, it was with somewhat languid interest that I addressed myself to the study of WILAMOWITZ's recent memoir on *Mimnermos and Propertius*. But the title misled me. The relation of Propertius to Mimnermos occupies only a small part of a paper, which, short as it is, would furnish forth half a dozen *Brief Mentions* with its wealth of comment and suggestion. Beginning with a critical study of the fragment in Stobaeus Flor. VII 11, the writer passes on to the discussion of the character of the old Ionic elegy, which, like the iambus, dealt with concrete things and not with the mere commonplaces of the anthologies, and then proceeds to reinforce the reading *λιγυστάδης* for *Διγυστάδης* in the familiar lines of Solon addressed to Mimnermos. The word is not a patronymic but a characteristic of the clear-voiced singer, who had no paternity worth mentioning. It appears also that when Solon bade Mimnermos change his song and substitute *ὀδῶν κονταίτη* for *ἔξη κονταίτη* in the notorious line, *ἔξη κονταίτη μοῖρα κίχοι θανάτου*, he was addressing not an old man but a young man to whom sixty years seemed many ages away, so that we have to go back to the old chronology, as we must hold to the old tradition that Mimnermos was a Colophonian, not a Smyrniote. Those who remember Byron's cynical use of the proverb *ἄριστα χολὸς οἰφεῖ* will be interested in WILAMOWITZ's discussion of it. The saying is ascribed to Mimnermos, but WILAMOWITZ finds no evidence of iambi in Mimnermos. Iambic poetry belongs to another region, was the vehicle of another school. The curious fact that a fragment of Mimnermos turns up in the Theognidea leads to a discussion of that famous collection, for which WILAMOWITZ desiderates a much more thorough treatment than it has received thus far. We must address ourselves, it appears, to the task of putting each fragment in its proper place and unmasking the creatures who have worked over bits of early poetry in the interest of stale moralities. From this point of view the Theognidea are more interesting than Theognis himself. Here it would seem to me that eidographic syntax might have something to say. Elegy and epos are not one, even if, as everybody knows, *ἐπη* is used of both. If *τὴν σαυτοῦ φρένα τέρπε* is Mimnermean, as WILAMOWITZ maintains, I die contented (A. J. P. XXXIII 107). It presents an aspect of 'Freut euch des Lebens' which is impossible for epic. *τὴν σαυτοῦ φρένα τέρπε* is not epic syntax. Epic syntax is what we find in the scandalous distich *οἶην μὲν μοῖραν δέκα μοιρέων τέρπεται ἀνὴρ, τὰς δέκα δ' ἐμπίπλησι γυνὴ τέρπουσα νόημα*.

---

The title Nanno, WILAMOWITZ goes on to say, is an Alexandrian device, the number of books, however, two, is a trustworthy tradition. And this Nanno brings us to the Cynthia

of Propertius, and the oft-quoted line: (1, 9, 12) Plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero. Of course, one does not need to be told that this mention of Mimnermos proves nothing for Propertius' first-hand acquaintance with the poet. Mimnermos was typical, just as Philainis was typical. Indeed, I doubt very much whether the anthologist who referred to Philainis as πολύχαρμος (A. P. V 202) was any better acquainted with the real Philainis than was my old Christian friend, Justin Martyr, who coupled her with that other apostle of the lust of the flesh, Archestratos. Even if Horace's line (Ep. 2, 2, 101) is accepted as an intimation that Propertius, not content with calling himself a Roman Kallimachos (4, 1, 64: Umbria Romani patria Callimachi) undertook to be a Mimnermos as well (fit Mimnermus et optivo cognomine crescit), that may be nothing more than the literary trick of taking a name in vain, a trick with which we are all familiar. The title Cynthia may have been suggested by Nanno, as Nanno itself was suggested by the Lyde of Antimachos; and WILAMOWITZ finds himself unable to show any direct contact between the Umbrian poet and the Colophonian. Apart from a couple of concrete fragments, the one that deals with the taking of Smyrna and the one that deals with the battle between the Smyrniotes and Gyges, apart from the barge of the sun, in which we recognize the barge of Arthur, there is nothing but a succession of sighs about the shortness of life and the brevity of youth, the transitoriness of golden Aphrodite, the unloveliness of old age—standing themes of erotic poetry. But he who is bent on discovering sources need never despair. Nothing would be more in Propertius' vein than correcting his original, and it might not be hard to maintain that in his description of the loves of Tithonus and Aurora (2, 18) he may have had in mind the lines of Mimnermos:

Τιθωνῷ μὲν ἔδωκεν ἔχειν κακὸν ἄφθιτον ὁ Ζεὺς  
γῆρας ὃ καὶ θανάτου ῥίγιον ἀργαλέον.

To judge by Propertius, Tithonus was a male Ninon, and his lees far better than the wine of younger men, a case fully set forth in Balzac's *Vieille fille*. It is only an accident that the Greek Anthology has not preserved companion-pieces to the poems which extol the *beaux restes* of ancient beauties (A. P. V 13, 258). And once on the subject of Propertius and parallels, I will not withhold the amusing contrast between homely Greek and elegant Latin which came up to my mind in reading Propertius (2, 22, 35):

aspice uti caelo modo sol modo luna ministret:  
sic etiam nobis una puella parum est.  
altera me cupidis teneat foveatque lacertis,  
altera si quando non sinit esse locum.



How much heartier the old verse and the comment thereon:

ἀ ὅς τὰν βύλανον τὰν μὲν ἔχει τὰν δ' ἔραται λαβεῖν·  
κάγῳ παῖδα καλὴν τὴν μὲν ἔχω τὴν δ' ἔραμαι λαβεῖν.

which is my favorite illustration of the *ethos* of the Greater Asclepiadean.

---

As a manner of preparation for the study of a book which had been insistently recommended to the good graces of *Brief Mention*, I took from its case and read over again after the lapse of some years Mr. Horton's *In Argolis*; for the scene of Mrs. DRAGOUMIS'S *Tales of a Greek Island* (Houghton Mifflin Company) is laid on Poros, and Mr. Horton's book deals with the life of Poros and incidentally with the life of Greece. I too have seen Poros, and for me also it has a charm of its own against which I had to be on my guard, if I was to be an honest critic. I saw it first as I was on my sea-way to Athens, when my eyes were greeted by a sight of the Royal yacht as it dashed out of the naval station at Poros; and I was afterwards to spend a memorable afternoon there, to ascend through the fragrant woods to the Temple of Poseidon and from that vantage-ground to behold Athens at a distance, as Demosthenes may have seen his Athens, when he staggered out of the sacred precinct, though his vision was doubtless blurred by the fatal drug which ended the long duel with the Macedonian. An ill-judged struggle, according to Professor Mahaffy. To some people all lost causes are ill-judged struggles. The Greek did not take his life with the ease of the Roman. Suicide was not a ready relief with him, but a last resort. Of course, the Greek woman yielded to despair sooner than the Greek man, and the national mode was a feminine mode. 'Go hang', we too say; and ἀγξυσθαι stands alone as a direct reflexive for self-murder. There was something feminine in the excitability of the Βάραλος, as his enemies called Demosthenes—something of the Megaira in his makeup. So Poros, as Kalaureia, has undying associations with death, and as Poros, it is beautiful. 'Lovely Poros', exclaimed our former Minister to Greece, the late Professor Alexander, 'lovely Poros, where the divine sea sparkles at one's feet, and the air is sweet with blossoms of orange and of lemon; where nightingales are always singing, and groves of aged olives give dignity to fields gay with poppies and anemones'. I know a man who crossed the Atlantic over and over again to summer at Sorrento, and I can understand that. I know another who would gladly cross the Atlantic and traverse the Mediterranean to see Poros once more and dream the dream of old age with the Sleeping Woman—a mountain, mind you, which figures in Mr. Horton's book as in Mrs. DRAGOUMIS'S: 'a great giantess asleep upon her

back. Wonderfully noble and classic are the features', continues Mr. Horton, 'serene unto death and yet with the intelligence of life'.

---

I have called Mr. Horton's book a preparation. I intended it as a prophylactic, because I remembered it as a book full of homely details, and I have a perverse way of disillusioning myself in advance in order that I may yield to the illusion more unreservedly afterwards. When I first saw the Oberammergau play in 1860, I made the acquaintance of the principal actors and actresses, and took beer with the protagonist of the great tragedy. Truth to tell, he bore himself in the familiar intercourse of daily life with a serene dignity which made me understand the play better and some other things also. So I took Mr. Horton's book, written by a clear-eyed American who was thoroughly familiar with the life he was describing, to be just the prophylactic I needed to keep me from falling under the Circean spell of Mrs. DRAGOUMIS. But if Mr. Horton's book is full of homely details, described with remorseless fidelity, there are homely details in Theokritos; and after all *In Argolis* is an idyll, as Mrs. DRAGOUMIS's tales are idyllic. Here is what Mr. Howells wrote of *In Argolis*: 'It is delightful, every word of it, with just that mixture of the epic and idyllic and domestic and divine that is peculiarly American'. Mr. Horton is as full of poetry as Mrs. DRAGOUMIS, and so after reading Mrs. DRAGOUMIS's book and yielding to its charm, I began to compare the two in detail, to note the differences and the coincidences, to count the recurrences, to make a list of the things that strike the casual tourist, the things that a long resident foreigner thought it worth while to interpret, the things that a native woman of refinement would dwell on, would glance at, would avoid. There is, for instance, no smell of garlic on Mrs. DRAGOUMIS's literary raiment. Mr. Horton's book may be said to be impregnated with it. The stench and filth—unmentionable filth which disillusiones the foreigner—are barely alluded to by the daughter of Greece who daintily draws her skirts away from the refuse-heap into which Mr. Horton resolutely thrusts his walking-stick. But when the American man and the Greek woman turn the fair side outward, they are rivals in poetical expression. If you want matter of fact, you must look to such a writer as Mr. Zimmern, who stands no nonsense about flowers and fruits. Greece, he says after Mr. Myres, is a jamless world; and nothing could present a sharper contrast than Mr. Horton's description of the asphodel and Mr. Zimmern's note on the same vegetable growth. Mr. Horton says of it: 'A stately plant, as befits the symbol of death; for it stands up tall and straight with stalks that branch out symmetrically from the main stem. The plain where it grows seems a great table, set with many silver candelabra'. Silver candelabra,

forsooth! Here is what Mr. Zimmern says of the asphodel: 'The asphodel is a sort of overgrown hyacinth, and is one of the commonest scrub flowers. To the ordinary Greek farmer the name conveyed nothing of the romance which our poets have woven round it' (Greek Commonwealth, p. 43). The fact is, wherever fancy comes in, fact suffers—perhaps ought to suffer. Zola's description of Rome is said to be marvellously exact in view of his short sojourn. But it suited him to say that there were no bells in Rome, 'those friends of the humble', nothing but domes; whereas Frederic Harrison complains that 'the air is heavy with the jangle of incessant belfries'.

---

But an analysis of recent books on Greece after the pattern of my syntactical studies would carry me too far, and the half dozen lines promised to Mrs. DRAGOUMIS's stories threatens to grow into a many page review. The charm of her book lies not only in the personality it reveals, but also in the vivid description of the scenery, the immediate vision she gives of the home life of the Poriotas, the sharp individuality of the characters. We cease to be tolerant, if we have been only tolerant before, we become sympathetic. The tales themselves are in the main sad, and the story by which these tragedies of humble life are bound together does not end in a true lover's knot. The boy and the girl of the opening go apart at the end. The situations, often sombre, are somewhat relieved by a certain Kyra Sophoula, who appears and reappears as a manner of chorus and whose acrid comments remind one of the tang of the *resinata*, which one must learn to like, it is said, if one is to get into tune with the Greece of to-day. Kyra Sophoula will linger in the memory longer than the gentler spirits that flit before us in Mrs. DRAGOUMIS's pages.

---

I have no qualms of conscience about the space I have given to Mr. Horton and yielded to Mrs. Dragoumis. Their books enter directly into the studies of the Hellenist. There is a constant increase in the number of scholars who make themselves personally acquainted with the land and the people of Hellas, with the language or rather the languages that are spoken on the sacred soil of Greece; and much to the advantage of those who are chiefly concerned with the life of the classical past. Books like Mr. Grundy's Thucydides and the History of His Age, like Mr. Zimmern's Greek Commonwealth have a vitality that comes from the sky and the land of Hellas. In my youth a man who knew the Greek of the Nineteenth Century was a rarity and there were few among my German teachers who could speak of Greece from actual vision. Welcker was one

and I shall never forget his description of a walk from Athens towards Eleusis, when he was overtaken by the same kind of storm that overcame the watchman and his fellows in the Antigone, *μίσ-αντες δ' εἶχονεν θέλειαν νόσον*. It was Welcker that introduced us to Alkiphron as a witness of the climatic conditions of Athens which had not changed so much after all. Franz was another of my teachers who was at home in Greece. He had been tutor to King Otho and was renowned for his familiar command of ancient Greek in writing and in speech. But with the modern tongue he had but little patience. He was a thorough-paced archaizer, and would not admit the analogy between Italian and Romaic. Modern Greek, he said, was not a new weft out of old material. It was a rag, a 'lappen'. It is not so many years since it was considered somewhat of a feat when Classen in his old age visited Greece in the interest of his Thukydides. Now with the recent facilities of travel every other tourist can talk of Athens, Epidaurus, Olympia. But as I recall my own visit, as I read the glowing descriptions of Mr. Horton and Mrs. Dragoumis I cannot suppress a word in favor of the Greece of our dreams, the Greece that was before the days of the tribe of Thomas Cook and Son. The changes in the land of Greece may, it is true, have gone on in some respects along the lines of classical times. Mountain and watercourse may enable us to follow the study of the ancient battlefields, but in order to reproduce the Greece of our boyhood, we must do as Méryon did, who in his etchings simply thought away much of the Paris of his times, and so in the vision of the actual Greece we must think away much that fills the eye and charms the eye. Read again the words that I have quoted from Professor Alexander's description of Poros. The sea is there and the olive-trees are there and there is a distinct gain in the sight of the Greek sea, and in contemplating the Greek olive-tree. But there were no oranges and lemons in the old days—to say nothing of the exotic eucalyptus. The people—delightful as some of them are—do not answer to the Greek type as we know it from the monuments. The conquest of the black over the blond which is going on everywhere is complete. It has been contended that even in antiquity the blond beauty was emphasized because of its rarity. I have read and heard that there are villages of odd corners of Greece where the blond type survives, but I was a little surprised at Mr. Horton's 'towheaded' urchins. I should never have used the adjective of the school-boys I saw assembled in Sparta. When as boys we were taught the history of the Persian War, we were told that it embodied the eternal conflict between Orient and Occident, and despite all that one reads in Curtius about the nearness of Greece to Asia Minor, its practical remoteness from Italy, it is hard to realize the orientalism of Greece. There is no touch of orientalism in the Greece that we learned in school. The Orient is with us at every turn in the Greece that now is.

Greece is not in Europe, and in some aspects the ineffable Greek is nearer to the unspeakable Turk than we are to either. The kingdom of Hellas is a spiritual kingdom.

---

All my fellow students of 1850-1853 are gone — Baumeister, Wölfflin, Hug, my close friend Hübner, to pick out a few of those whose names are written in the chronicles of scholarship. Vahlen was the last to go, working to the end and ever widening the distance that separated him from the mass of those who sat on the same benches with him in the days of Bonn and of Ritschl. I paid my tribute to him while he was living. What can my small voice add to the chorus of eulogy now? I can only protest against the keynote that makes itself heard whenever a veteran falls—a keynote I myself have struck from time to time. Do not call him the exemplar of a bygone day. There is no bygone day for any life that has been so well worth living as Vahlen's.

---

Another scholar, not a fellow-student but a close contemporary, withdrawn for some years from active work as a teacher but busy in his chosen field so long as health and strength permitted, has joined the quiet ranks of those whose labors are over. A master workman he, who won for American scholarship a name that gained recognition for his countrymen. Not a fellow-student of mine, for he came to Germany after my time, William Watson Goodwin seems to count as one, for he followed the teachings of very much the same masters at Göttingen and elsewhere and underwent the same influences, though the fruit of his studies was not so long withheld. When Bernays was gathering the material for his *Life of Scaliger*, Ritschl warned him against postponing publication too long. 'Don't let your chestnuts get burned', said he; and Goodwin did not let his chestnuts get burned—whether of German origin or homegrown. In my eyes the *Moods and Tenses* was an audacious venture for so young a man—it was published in 1860, when he was not yet thirty—but the blockade of the Southern States shut me out from all intercourse with foreign scholarship for four long years, so that I could not follow the fortunes of the *Moods and Tenses*; and it was not until the Civil War was over that I discovered how brilliant a success the *Moods and Tenses* had been. Introduced under favorable circumstances into England at a time when English Hellenists were not familiar with Krüger and Madvig, the work became a standard. Quite apart from his command of what was the common property of all who had been trained in Germany, Goodwin brought to his task qualities that commended them.



selves to the practical Anglo-Saxon mind. No specialist could reproach him with supersubtlety, prolixity, obscurity, or the impertinence of figurative language; and what some might have considered a defect—the absence of definitions—was in the eyes of others one recommendation the more. Goodwin was more concerned with the behavior of the moods and tenses than with their origin, and applied to them the rules that sensible people apply to commerce with the world at large. The high position thus early gained as an ultimate authority for English-speaking Hellenists, the *Moods and Tenses* has maintained for half a century, and the term of its usefulness is not in sight. Each successive issue was enriched by wider reading and closer observation, until the author gathered himself up for the great Revised Edition, which has made all the others obsolete and which became a finality for Goodwin himself. Most of us crystallize long before sixty, though few of us are aware of the process.

---

Goodwin's activity did not limit itself to matters grammatical. He was an authority on Attic law; he was a close student of Greek history; he was versed in the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. His edition of Demosthenes' *De Corona* is the culmination of a lifelong study of the orator and his times. But it is the *Moods and Tenses* that has made him known wherever Greek is studied, and as an interesting specimen of the attitude of the undergraduate mind towards this renowned text-book I copy from the daily press the following tribute to the Harvard scholar's great achievement: 'In the *Moods and Tenses*', says an editorial writer in the *New York Sun* of June 20, '<Goodwin> collected with an inhuman industry and an Attic or Indian subtlety all the deviltries of a copious, casuistic and perfidious syntax, collected them for the wonder and despair of a generation.' One seems to be reading a legend of the construction of some mediaeval cathedral, some mediaeval bridge, in which the Evil One is supposed to have had a hand. To have left a typical name,—there is nothing better than that even for the Scaligers, the Bentleys, the Porsons, whom the irresponsible chronicler of current events always cites whenever a classical scholar is gathered to his fathers.

---

C. W. E. M.: Whilst the palaeographer has every reason to be grateful for the number, variety, and excellence of the collections of palaeographic facsimiles that have been published in recent years, it is nevertheless true that most of these collections have been so expensive as to be beyond the reach of the average scholar, and so unwieldy as to attract few but specialists. But two years ago, the firm of Marcus and Weber in Bonn in-

augurated a series of inexpensive and handy collections of facsimiles, which, bearing the title of *Tabulae in usum scholarum* are being issued under the editorial supervision of JOHANNES LIETZMANN.

The second number of this series now lies before me, the *Papyri Graecae Berolinenses*, Collegit WILHELM SCHUBART (Bonnae, A. Marcus et E. Weber; Oxoniae, apud Parker et Filium; MCMXI; 20X30 cm., cloth, flexible covers; M. 6.). The object of the present work is a threefold one: 1. To provide reading matter for beginners. 2. To illustrate the various kinds of papyri. 3. To furnish materials for the use of the trained palaeographer. In view of this threefold object, the collection has been made to embrace literary, epistolary, and documentary material of many kinds and of every degree of difficulty. The editor has even called into requisition a few ostraka, two parchments, and a wax-tablet, and, in three instances, he has not hesitated to go outside of Berlin to secure certain material without which the collection would not have been complete. The facsimiles are eighty in number and have been distributed among fifty plates. These plates have been arranged in chronological order, and, where definite chronological data have been lacking, the author has been obliged to use his own judgment as to the proper sequence. As the chronological order does not correspond with the order of difficulty, a table has been supplied in which, besides a division into literary and non-literary specimens, there appears also a subdivision of the non-literary facsimiles into those that are easy, medium, and difficult. The plates are accompanied by twenty-eight pages of letter press, which, in addition to the transliteration of most of the facsimiles, give the necessary information as to the provenance, place of publication, contents, chronology, style of writing, etc., of all of the specimens, the whole concluding with a tabular conspectus of the plates. From the point of view of those beginners who have no access to the Berliner Griechische Urkunden, the Elephantine Papyri, the Berliner Klassiker Texte, it was perhaps a mistake not to have furnished the complete transcription of every facsimile. Fortunately, the number of such omissions is small, and the usefulness of the book is not seriously impaired. But apart from this consideration, it may be said without prejudice to the merits of previous publications that the work described above has supplied a long-felt want. There was need of just such a convenient, inexpensive, and attractive volume as this, containing such an abundance and variety of material, and compiled and edited by so competent a papyrologist as SCHUBART. The book is destined to give a great impetus to the study of Greek palaeography and of Greek papyrology, and both editor and publishers deserve our congratulations and sincere thanks.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Thanks are due to Messrs. Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 W. 27th St., New York, for material furnished.

### AMERICAN AND ENGLISH.

British School of Athens Annual. Index to Nos. I to XVI. London, 1912. 8°, 10s. net.

Caesar in Britain and Belgium; simplified text, with notes by J. H. Sleeman. New York, *Putnam*. 123 pp. il. 16°, 45 c. net.

Cicero (Marcus Tullius). Select orations; ed. by B. L. D'Ooge. Boston, *B. H. Sanborn & Co.* 87+406+146 pp. il. pls. pors. maps, plan. 12°, \$1.15.

— Seven orations; ed. by W. B. Gunnison and W. S. Harley. New York, *Silver, Burdett*. 42+501 pp. il. pors. maps. 12°, \$1.25.

Daniels (E. D.) Latin drill and composition. Boston, *Heath*. 13+112 pp. 12°, 40 c.

Demosthenes. The public orations of Demosthenes; tr. by A. W. Pickard-Cambridge. In 2 v. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 264; 208 pp. fold. map. 12°, \$2 net.

Greek literature; lectures delivered at Columbia University. New York, *Columbia University Press*, Lemcke & Buechner, Agts. 7+316 pp. 8°, \$2 net.

Harry (J. E.) Studies in Sophocles. *University of Cincinnati*. 46 pp. 8°, pap., 50 c.

Homer. The women of the Iliad; a metrical translation by H. W. Taylor. New York, *Broadway*. 2+7-66 pp. 8°, \$1.

Horace. The odes tr. into English verse by W. S. Morris. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 115 pp. 16°, \$1.

Norris (P. C.) The fundamental principles of Latin. 5 pts. *Princeton University Press*, 1911. 8°, \$1.

Robins (Fk. Eggleston). The hexaëmeral literature. Chicago, *University of Chicago Press*. 3+104 pp. 8°, 50 c. net.

Sandys (J. E.) A companion to Latin studies. New York, *Putnam*. 891+35 pp. il. maps, \$6 net.

Symphosius. The hundred riddles; tr. into English verse, by E. H. du Bois. Woodstock, Vt., *Elm Tree Press*. 86 pp. 8°, \$2.

Thompson (J.) A first-year Latin book. New York, *Putnam*. 227+17 pp. 12°, 50 c. net.

Wilson (J. C.) Aristotelian studies. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 87-103 pp. 8°, pap., \$1.25 net.

Wolff (S. L.) The Greek Romances in Elizabethan Prose Fiction. New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1912. 9, 529 pp. 8°, \$2 net.

Wright (Jos.) Comparative grammar of the Greek language. New York, *Oxford University Press*. 404 pp. 8°, \$2 net.

## FRENCH.

- Floquet (A.) Homère médecin (89 pp.), in-8°. *J. Roussel.* 2 fr. 50.  
 Puech (Aimé). Les apologistes grecs du IIe siècle de notre ère, in-8°. *Hachette et Cie.* 7 fr. 50.  
 Reinach (A. J.) Bulletin annuel d'épigraphie grecque (3e année), in-8°. *E. Leroux.* 2 fr. 50.  
 Reinach (Théodore). Les hymnes delphiques à Apollon (Extrait des Fouilles de Delphes), grav., in-4°, 10 fr.

## GERMAN.

- Andreopoli, Mich., über Syntipae. Ed. Vict. Jernstedt. Aus. "Mémoires de l'acad. imp. des sciences de St. Pétersbourg". (xvii, 200 S. m. 1 Taf.) Lex. 8° St. Pétersbourg 1912. (Leipzig, *Voss' Sort.*) 6.  
 Apollinarij metaphrasis psalmorum. Recensuit A. Ludwich. (xxxviii. 308 S.) kl. 8° Lipsiae 1912. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* 6; geb. 6.50.  
 Bachofen (J. J.) Römische Grablampen. Anstat. Neudr. 2 Bde. (Text u. Tafelbd.) (xxix, 123 S. m. 55 Taf.) gr. 8° bzw. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *K. W. Hiersemann* (1890). 1912. geb. in Leinw. 20.  
 Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Hrsg. von M. v. Schanz. Lex. 8°. Würzburg, *C. Kabitzsch.* 19 Heft. Grünewald (C.) Die Satzpa enthesen bei den 10 attischen Rednern (61 S.) 1912. 2.50. Maidhof (Adam). Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Koine besonders auf Grund des Attizisten Moiris. (vi, 97 S.) 1912. 4.  
 Blümner (Hugo). Technologie u. Terminologie der Gewerbe u. Künste bei Griechen u. Römern. I. Bd. 2. gänzlich umgearb. Aufl. (xii, 364 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* 1912. 14; geb. in Halbfz. 17.  
 Boisacq (E.) Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. 8e livr. Heidelberg. 1912. 8°. 2 m.  
 Caer (Paul). Grammatica militans. Umgearb. u. stark verm. Aufl. (xi, 227 S.) 8° Berlin, *Weidmann.* 1912. geb. in Leinw. 5.  
 Ceretelli (Greg.) et Serg. Sobolevski. Exempla codicum graecorum. Vol. I. Codices Mosquenses. Mosquae u. Leipzig. 1911. Fol. 43 Taf. Mit 15 pp. Text. 40 m.  
 Diadochi (Sancti) episcopi Photicensis de perfectione spirituali capita centum. Ed. J. E. Weis-Liebersdorf. (vi, 165 S.) kl. 8° Lipsiae. 1912. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* 3.20; geb. 3.60.  
 Dissertationes philologicae Halenses. Vol. XX. gr. 8° Halle, M. Niemeyer. Pars 4. Schaefer (Ioannes); De Iove apud Cares culto. (vii u. S. 345-477.) 1912. 4.80. — dasselbe. Vol. XXI. gr. 8° Ebd. Pars 1. Schmidt (Bruno). De Cornuti theologiae graecae compendio capita duo. (x, 306 S.) 1912. 3.60.  
 Ehrlich (Hg.) Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung. Berlin. 1912. 8°. xi, 275 pp. 8 m.  
 Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft. Hrsg. v. Gercke u. Norden. 1. Bd. Methodik, griechische u. römische Literatur, Sprache, Metrik. 2. Aufl. (xi, 632 S.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* 1912. 13; geb. in Leinw. 15.  
 Epitome thesauri latini, adornavit et auxiliantibus compluribus ed. Fr. Vollmer. Vol. I. Fasc. I. Confecerunt Fr. Vollmer et E. Bickel. (Sp. 1-160.) 32 x 22.5 cm. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner.* 1912. 2; Subskr.-Pr. 1.50.  
 Erbe, Das, der Alten. Schriften üb. Wesen u. Wirkg. der Antike, ges. u. hrsg. v. O. Crusius, O. Immisch, Th. Zielinski. Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *Dieterich.* 4. Heft. Hirzel, Rud. Plutarch. (viii, 211 S. m. 2 Taf.) 1912. 4; geb. 5; in Perg. 8.

Festgabe f. Martin v. Schanz, zur 70. Geburtstagsfeier (12. 6. 1912). (vi, 373 S. m. 1 Abbildg.) Lex. 8°. Würzburg, *C. Kabitzsch*. 1912. 12.

Finsler (G.) Homer in der Neuzeit von Dante bis Goethe. Italien, Frankreich, England, Deutschland. Leipzig. 1912. 8°. xiv, 530 pp. 12 m.

Gomperz (H.) Sophistik u. Rhetorik. (vi, 292 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 1912. 10; geb. 12.

Hedén (Erik). Homerische Götterstudien. (iv, 191 S.) 8°. Upsala, *Akadem. Buchh.* 1912. nn 4.50.

Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. IV. Heronis definitiones. Ed. J. L. Heiberg. (xxix, 450 S. m. 62 Fig.) 8°. Lipsiae 1912. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 9; geb. 9.80.

Homeri opera. Recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit Thom. W. Allen. Tom. V. (xii, 281 S.) 8°. Oxonii. 1912. Oxford. *Clarendon Press*. 3.

Inscriptiones graecae. Consilio et auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae editae. 40.5×29.5 cm. Berlin, *G. Reimer*. XI, 1 ist noch nicht erschienen. XI, 2. Inscriptiones Deli. Consilio et auctoritate academiae inscriptionum et humaniorum litterarum francogallicae ed. Fasc. II, Inscriptiones Deli liberae. Tabulae archontum. Tabulae hieropoeorum annorum 314–250 ed. Fel. Dürrbach. (viii, 149 S. m. 4 Taf.) 1912. geb. in Halbleinw. 26.

Joannides (E.) Sprechen Sie attisch? 3. Aufl. (80 S.) kl. 8°. Dresden, *C. A. Koch*. 1912. geb. in Leinw. 1.50.

Knomayer (Johs.) Antike Schlachtfelder. III Bd. Antike Schlachtfelder in Italien und Afrika. Herausg. von J. Kromayer und G. Veith, 2. Abtlg. Afrika. Von *G. Veith*. Berlin, 1912. 8°. X. u. pp. 495–935. Mit 11 lith. Karten, 23 Textabbildgn. u. den Registern für das ganze Werk. 18 m.

Leo (Frdr.) Plantinische Forschungen. 2. Aufl. (vii, 375 S.) gr. 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 1912. 11.

Leuze (Osc.) Zur Geschichte der römischen Censur. (vii, 156 S.) gr. 8°. Halle, *M. Niemeyer*. 1912. 5.

Ludwich (Arth.) Die Homerdeuterin Demo. 2. Bearbeitg. ihrer Fragmente. I. Progr. (32 S.) gr. 8°. Königaberg, *Akadem. Buchh.* 1912. 40.

Menandrea ex papyris et membranis vestutissimis, iterum ed. Alfred. Koerte. Ed. maior. (lxiv, 192 S. m. 2 Taf.) kl. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 1912. 3; geb. in Leinw. 3.40.

Palaestra. Untersuchungen u. Texte aus der deutschen u. engl. Philologie, hrsg. v. A. Brandl, G. Roethe u. E. Schmidt. gr. 8°. Berlin, *Mayer & Müller*. 113. Vollert (Konr.) Zur Geschichte der lateinischen Facetien-sammlungen des XV. u. XVI. Jahrh. (iii, 141 S.) 1912. 3.60. 19, 42, 48, 56, 70, 72, 80, 81, 83, 90, 95, 100, 105 u. 109–111 sind noch nicht erschienen.

Paulus Aeginetes. Pauli Aeginetae libri III. interpretatio latina antiqua. Ed. J. L. Heiberg. (xiv, 242 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae 1912. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 4.40.

Petronii satirae et liber priapeorum. Recensuit Franciscus Buecheler. Editionem V curavit Guil. Heraeus. (iv, 282 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*. 1912. 3.40.

Ptolemäus. Handbuch der Astronomie. 1. Bd. Übers. u. m. erklär. Anmerkgn. versehen v. K. Manitius. (xxviii, 462 S. m. Fig. u. 1 Taf.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. 8; geb. 8.60.

Sammlung mittellateinischer Texte, hrsg. v. Alfons Hilka. 8°. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*. Werner (Jak.) Lateinische Sprichwörter u. Sinnsprüche des Mittelalters. (viii, 112 S.) 1912. 2.20. *Historia septem sapientum*.



I. Eine bisher unbekannte latein. Übersetzg. Hrsg. u. erklärt v. Alfons Hilka. (xxv, 35 S.) 1912. 1.20.

Schlick (Wilh.) Favorin *περὶ παίδων τροφῆς*. (vi, 42 S.) Lex. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. 1.50.

Schmidt (Mx. C. P.) Die Entstehung der antiken Wasseruhr. Leipzig, 1912. 8°. V, 113 pp. Mit 13 Taf. 3 m.

Sophokles, Tragödien. Ins Deutsche übers. v. Carl Bruch. Neue Ausg. (II, 380 S.) 8°. Heidelberg, *Carl Winter*, 1912. In Pappbd. 3.

Steffens (Frz.) Proben aus griechischen Handschriften u. Urkunden. 24 Taf. (8 S. Text.) 36 × 28.5 cm. Trier, *Kunst- u. Verlagsanstalt Schaar & Dathe*, 1912. In Halbleinw.-Mappe 7.50.

Stemplinger (Edu.) Das Plagiat in der griechischen Literatur. Preisgekrönt (März 1911). (vi, 293 S.) gr. 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. 10; geb. 12.

Stroux (Ioa.) De Theophrasti virtutibus dicendi. (vi, 126 S.) gr. 8°. Lipsiae, 1912. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*. 4.80; geb. 5.60.

Thesaurus linguae latinae. Vol. III, fasc. 9. u. Suppl., fasc. 3. Leipzig, 1911. 15 m. 40 pf.

Thukydides. Erklärt v. J. Classen. V. Bd. 5. Buch. 3. Aufl., bearb. v. J. Steup. (vii, 287 S.) 8°. Berlin, *Weidmann*, 1912. 3.20.

Vitae Vergilianae. Recensuit Jacob. Brummer. (xxii, 74 S.) kl. 8°. Lipsiae, 1912. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. 2; geb. 2.40.

Weber (Wilh.) Aegyptisch-griechische Götter im Hellenismus. Rede. (42 S.) Lex. 8°. Groningen, *J. B. Wolters*, 1912. 1.

Ziellinski (Th.) Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte. 3. durchgeseh. Aufl. (viii, 371 S.) 8°. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. 6; geb. in Leinw. 7.

## ITALIAN.

Cessi (C.) La poesia ellenistica. Bari, 1912. 16°. X, 488 pp. L. 5.

Lucini (Gian Pietro). Le nottole ed i vasi. Traduzione dal greco della decadenza con note. Ancona, 8°, fig., p. 500, con 7 tav. L. 5.

Monumenti antichi pubblicati per cura della Reale Accademia dei Lincei. Vol. XX. Punt. 2. Milano, 1912. 4°. pp. 360-930. Con 16 tav. e 215 incis. L. 65.

— Punt. 2a. Milano, 1912. 4°. pp. 360-930. Con fig. e 16 tav. L. 65.

Papiri greci e latini. Vol. I, n. 1-111, con 13 tav. Firenze. L. 30.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

Allen (Hamilton Ford). Two Mummy-Labels in the Carnegie Museum. Reprinted from *Annals of the Carnegie Museum*, Vol. VIII, No. 2, 1912.

Antike Schlachtfelder. Bausteine zu einer Antiken Kriegsgeschichte. Von Johannes Kromayer. Dritter Band: Italien und Afrika. Zweite Abteilung: Afrika. Von G. Veith. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1912. 18 m.

ΑΘΗΝΑ. Σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν τῆς ἐν Ἀθήναις Ἑπιστημον Ἑταιρείας. Τόμ. εἰστος τοῦ τεταρτοῦ, τεύχος τρίτον. Ἀθήνησιν, 1912.

Calhoun (G. M.) Should the Teacher of Latin Know Greek? Bulletin of the University of Texas, General Series 25, Austin, Texas.

Cauer (Paul). Grammatica militans. Erfahrungen und Wünsche im Gebiete des lateinischen und griechischen Unterrichtes. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1912.

Cuq (Édouard). Le Sénatus-Consulte de Délos de l'an 166 avant notre ère. Extrait des Mémoires de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Tome XXXIX. Paris, *Imprimerie Nationale*, 1912. 1.70 fr.

Daniels (Ernest D.) Latin Drill and Composition. Boston, New York, Chicago, *D. C. Heath*.

Deutsch (Monroe E.) Notes on the Text of the Corpus Tibullianum. University of California Publications in Classical Philology, June 1, 1912.

Di Bella (Anselmo). La Commedia di Menandro. Catania, *Francesco Battiato*, 1912. L. 2.50.

Diehl (Ernest). Inscriptiones Latinae: Tabulae in usum scholarum editae sub cura Johannis Lietzmann. Bonn, *A. Marcus et E. Weber*, 1912.

Eastern and Western Review. May, June, July, 1912. *I. I. Timayenis*, Boston, Mass. @ 20 c.

Ehrlich (Hugo). Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1912. 8 m.

English Dictionary (Oxford). Ed. by Sir James A. H. Murray. THYZZLE. Vol. IX. Oxford, *At the Clarendon Press*: New York, Henry Frowde, 1912. \$1.25.

Epitome Thesauri Latini: Adornavit et Auxillantibus Compluribus Edidit Fr. Vollmer. Vol. I. Fasc. I. A-AEDILIS. Confecerunt Fr. Vollmer et E. Bickel. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912. 2 m.

Euphorion. Zeitschrift für Literaturgeschichte, herausg. von August Sauer. Neuntes Ergänzungsheft. Leipzig u. Wien, *Karl Fromme*, 1911. 10 m.

Formae Urbis Romae Antiquae. Delineaverunt H. Kiepert et Ch. Huelssen. Accedit Nomenclator Topographicus. Ed. Altera auctior et emendatior. Berlin, *Dietrich Reimer, Ernst Vohsen*, 1912.

Gregory (Caspar René). Vorschläge für eine kritische Ausgabe des griechischen Neuen Testaments. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung*, 1912.

— Wellhausen und Johannes. Zweite durchgesehene und vermehrte Auflage. Leipzig, *J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung*, 1910.

Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie u. Altertumskunde. Begründet von G. Bühler, fortgesetzt v. F. Kielhorn. Herausg. v. H. Lüders u. J. Wackernagel. II. Band, 5. Heft. *Ethnography*, by Sir Athelstane Baines. With a list of the more important works on Indian Ethnography by W. Siegling. Strassburg, *Verlag v. Karl J. Trubner*, 1912.

Grünwald (C.) Die Satzparenthese bei den zehn Attischen Rednern. Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Herausg. v. M. v. Schanz. Heft. 19. Würzburg, *Verlag von Curt Kabitzsch*, 1912. 2.50 m.

Guglielmino (Francesco). *Arte e Artificio nel Dramma Greco*. Catania, *Battiato*, 1912. 4 l.

Hamilton (G. L.) La source d'un épisode de Baudouin de Sabourc. Sonderabdruck aus der Zeitschrift für Romanische Philologie. XXXVI Band. 1912.

Hartmann (Jacob Wittmer). The Gōngu-Hrólfssaga: A Study in Old Norse Philology, New York, *Columbia University Press*, 1912.

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology. Vol. XXIII, 1912. *Harvard University*, Cambridge, Mass.

Hermann (Elizabeth Adelalde). *Histrionics in the Dramas of Franz Grillparzer*. *University of California Publications in Modern Philology*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 239-309, June 15, 1912.

Hermes. Herausg. von Friedrich Leo u. Carl Robert. XLVII Band. 3. Heft. Berlin, *Weidmannsche Buchhandlung*, 1912.

Hesperia. Schriften zur germanischen Philologie, herausgegeben von Hermann Collitz. No. 1. Das Schwache Praeteritum und seine Vorgeschichte. Göttingen, *Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht*: Baltimore, *The Johns Hopkins Press*, 1912. 8 m.

Journal of Hellenic Studies (The). Vol. XXII. Part I. London, *Macmillan & Co.*, 1912.

Latin and Greek, The Teaching of. Recommendations of the Classical Association. London, *John Murray*. 1 sh. net.

Machen (J. Gresham). The Hymns of the First Chapter of Luke, and The Origin of the First Two Chapters of Luke. Reprinted from the *Princeton Theological Review*, Vol. X (1912), Nos. 1 and 2.

Maidhof (Adam). Zur Begriffsbestimmung der Koine besonders auf Grund des Attizisten Moiris. Beiträge zur Historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache. Herausg. v. M. v. Schanz. Heft. 20. Würzburg, *Verlag v. Curt Kabitzsch*, 1912. 4 m.

Meltzer (Hans). Griechische Syntax, Bedeutungslehre und Verwandtes. 1904-1910. Hannover, 1911.

Μελέτη (H). *Μηνιαίον δημοσίευμα*. Τεύχος 40'. 'Απρλ. 1912. ἐν Ἀθήναις 1 δραχ.

Munro (J. Iverach). A Research into the Origin of the Third Personal Pronoun 𐤀𐤍 Epicene in the Pentateuch and its Connexion with Semitic and Indo-European Languages. Printed by aid of the Earl of Moray Endowment for the Promotion of Original Research, University of Edinburgh. London, *Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press*, 1912. 1s. 6d.

Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, Geschichte u. deutsche Literatur u. für Pädagogik. Herausg. v. J. Ilberg u. Paul Cauer. Fünftehnter Jahrg., 1912. XXIX. u. XXX. Bandes 5. 6. u. 7. Heft. Leipzig, *B. G. Teubner*, 1912.

Nye (Irene). Sentence Connection, Illustrated chiefly from Livy. (Yale Diss.) 1912.

Pascal (Carlo). Le Credenze d'oltretomba nelle opere letterarie dell' antichità classica. Vol. I, II. Catania, *Francesco Battiato*, 1912. @ 8 l.

v. Pöhlmann (Robert). Geschichte der sozialen Frage u. des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt. Zweite, vermehrte u. verbesserte Auflage I. u. II. Bandes. München, *C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhndg.*, 1912. 26 m.

Rand (E. K.) The Latin Concordance of Dante and the Genuineness of his Latin Works. Twenty-ninth Report of the Dante Society. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1912.

Rheinisches Museum für Philologie. Herausg. v. A. Brinkmann. N. F. LXVII. 2. Frankfurt a M., 1912.

Robbins (Frank Egleston). The Hexaëmeral Literature. A Study of the Greek and Latin Commentaries on Genesis. (Chicago Diss.) *The University of Chicago Press*, Chicago, 1912.

Schönemann (Friedrich). L. Achim von Arnims geistige Entwicklung. Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literatur-Geschichte. Herausg. v. Professor Dr. Oskar F. Walzel. Neue Folge. Heft XII. Leipzig, *H. Haessel Verlag*, 1912. 6 m.

Steele (R. B.) Case Usage in Livy. III. The Accusative. Leipzig, *F. A. Brockhaus*, 1912.

Smith (C. A.) The American Short Story. Boston, *Ginn & Co.*, 1912.

Thallusa. Carmen Joannis Pascoli, dum corriguntur plagulae, eheu, nobis ademti. In Certamine Poetico Hoeufftiano Praemio Aureo Ornatum. Amsterdam, 1912.

v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (Ulrich). Neues von Kallimachos. Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften. XXIX. 1912.

Zürcher (Otto). Jens Baggesens Parthenais. Eine literarhistorische Untersuchung (Untersuchungen zur neueren Sprach- und Literaturgeschichte). Herausg. von Oskar F. Walzel. Leipzig, *H. Haessel*, 1912. 3 m.